VOLUME VII NUMBER 1

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

JANUARY 1933

EDITORIAL

In this issue Dr. Leibbrandt completes his discussion of the great immigration of the German Mennonites from Russia to the United States and Canada of two generations ago. As in the first instalment he treated primarily the governmental aspect of the movement as it developed in Russia and entered into the relations between the Russian Government and the Governments of Great Britain and the United States, so in the second and concluding instalment he traces the governmental aspects of the movement in the new world from the point of view of the authorities on this side of the ocean. A most interesting and valuable feature of the discussion is the rather full outline of the debates in the United States Congress and the Canadian Parliament which were occasioned by the requests to grant the prospective immigrants special concessions. Interesting also is the story of the attempt by the Mennonites to provide for the establishment of closed colonies and an autonomous social organization in their new homes. What is needed now is a thorough study of the outcome of this attempt of the Russian Mennonites to maintain a separate social identity in their new environment. Such a study should trace for us the story of the interrelation and partial fusion of what might be called "Mennonite culture" and the indigenous culture of America. This is as yet an unwritten chapter in Mennonite history. To a certain degree this attempt of the Russian Mennonites of 1873 to maintain a social "separation from the world" as they moved from one land to another, is merely a striking illustration of what has been involved in practically all the historic Mennonite migrations. The problem of "separation" is moreover still a living problem in large sections of world Mennonitism. In the understanding of this problem is to be found the key to the understanding of much that is characteristically Mennonite.

It is an old story that many of the traditions of history which have come to be firmly believed turn out under careful scrutiny to be without factual foundation. This is not to say that such unhistorical traditions have always been due to deliberate deception or even creative fancy. Sometimes they have arisen from careless reading of sources or from uncritical interpretation of what is correctly read. This is apparently the way in which the tradition arose that William Rittenhouse was the first Mennonite

bishop in America. On the basis of the evidence adduced, Professor Bender seems to have demonstrated that this particular Rittenhouse tradition is unhistorical. His brief discussion of this question also includes a translation of the important letter of 1708 from Germantown to Holland, which has apparently never been published before either in the original or in translation.

More serious often than the unhistorical character of lesser traditions, is the unhistorical character of general interpretations of history. How often earlier interpretations have had to be revised in the light of better understanding of the nature of forces at work, or a more complete knowledge of the factors in a situation! And how often it has been discovered, that in spite of the most diligent attempts to be impartial, thought patterns of the time, or the *Zeitgeist,* have moulded the interpretations of history offered by historians. And at times unconscious motivations have moulded interpretations which were intended by the author to be altogether unbiased. After all, perhaps most interpretations are colored by the attitude and interests of their makers. In a critical discussion in this issue John Horsch rightly shows that the recent interpretation of early Dutch Anabaptist history by Professor W. J. Kuehler of Amsterdam is subject to criticism on this basis. He demonstrates that Dr. Kuehler has not altogether succeeded in faithfully and accurately interpreting the early Dutch Anabaptists, and that the validity of his judgments is impaired by his own religious and ecclesiastical attitudes and interests. He vigorously and convincingly challenges the historicity and authenticity of many features in Dr. Kuehler's picture of the early Dutch Anabaptists. His method is to state Dr. Kuehler's conclusions and then offer documentary evidence to the contrary. On such a basis it must be possible to arrive at the truth. Mere dogmatic assertions on the part of one historian would not carry weight. As it is, we should be interested in learning what Dr. Kuehler may have to say in reply to John Horsch's evidence, for it seems to us that the evidence offered is of the sort that cannot be gainsaid. The discussion which Horsch gives is to be understood as a treatment of the general issues raised by the Kuehler book rather than as a review proper of the book. He goes to considerable pains and length to present his material fairly and adequately, and the discussion will be continued through a second instalment. The series of articles on early Swiss Brethren history will be resumed in a later issue of the Review.

Instead of continuing the series by Professor Enss with his third article on "Christianity and Philosophy", we present in this issue a very brief note on the use of the term "religion" in the Bible showing that "religion" is not a biblical concept. The note is called forth by a question that has been raised concerning the first article in the series, "Christianity and Religion". The next article in the series will appear in the April issue of the Review.

THE EMIGRATION OF THE GERMAN MENNONITES FROM RUSSIA TO THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, 1873-1880

II

DR. GEORG LEIBBRANDT, Washington, D. C.

In the meantime, after failing to observe any prospect that the Russian government would grant exemption from military service, the Mennonites held conferences at which they decided to send their representatives to America to study the land and determine whether the conditions there would permit them to live their own life in accordance with their religious belief.

They were encouraged to do so by a group of four young men from the Molotschna colonies, who had made a trip to North America in 1872, during which they had visited some of the western states and made contact with their brethren. One of them remained in Canada and was requested by the Dominion Government to make a tour of investigation through several districts in Manitoba. On this trip he was accompanied by Jacob Y. Schantz of Waterloo, Ontario, a leader of the Canadian Mennonites. Of his investigations he wrote very favorably to his relatives in Russia.[45] The other three young men returned to their colonies enthusiastic about the prospects in the New World.

These favorable communications about North America furthered the plan to emigrate thither, and those communities which were most interested in the emigration chose delegates to be sent across the sea to make a final investigation. The deputations left

---

[45] Upon returning from the journey he wrote to the Canadian government (November 28, 1872) that as regards the probability of an emigration of his Russian friends to this province he thought that although the winter was a little harder and about four to six weeks longer than in South Russia, this would not be a hindrance to the acceptance of the offer of the Canadian government; that the lands were very well adapted for agricultural purposes and in quality above his expectations; and that when the delegations would arrive the following spring, larger tracts should be shown to them. He sent to Russia the notes which he had taken during the trip. The report of this investigation through Manitoba which was submitted by Schantz to J. H. Pope, Minister of Agriculture, was published by the Department of Agriculture in 1873 under the title: *"Narrative of a journey to Manitoba, by J. Y. Schantz; together with an abstract of the Dominion Act, and an extract from the government pamphlet on Manitoba."* A copy is in the Mennonite Historical Library at Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana.

in the spring of 1873 by different routes and in four separate groups. En route to America one of them visited the Mennonites in eastern Pennsylvania, where a delegate from that district joined them in their purpose. Before leaving Russia the representatives were given detailed instructions as to what they were to ask from the governments in America.[46] Essentially the demands were to be the same as those indicated in the petitions handed to the British and American consuls: full religious freedom together with the freedom from military service, suitable land for a moderate price, and, if possible, financial assistance in meeting the cost of transportation, which assistance had already been offered by the Canadian government.

There was, however, one point in the instructions which had not been mentioned in the petitions of 1872. Except for the assurance of freedom from military service, this point was the most important one, and for the delegates to America was to be the governing requirement according to which the land for the settlement was to be chosen. It was the request for the right to live in *closed settlements* with the privilege of *autonomous local administration* and with the use of the *German language,* which also involved as they thought, *their own German schools.* Hence great emphasis was laid upon the desire to preserve their national life which to them was closely connected with religious freedom, as indicated in the instructions. Closed communities they believed to be the prerequisite for the maintenance of their religious and national integrity. The future of every aspect of their social life was dependent upon securing the right to settle in the same way as they had settled three generations before when their grandfathers came to Russia. That form of settlement had proved very satisfactory to them and hence was very worthy of imitation in the new country.

To make the closed colonies possible, only those regions could be taken into consideration where large areas of unoccupied land were yet available. Such land was to be found only on the western frontier where the governments still had available for distribution large stretches of uninhabited land, or where it could be secured from the railroad companies. The frontier at that time ran from Manitoba through Dakota, Nebraska and Kansas down to Texas. These therefore were the states, where the delegations had to search for the necessary land.

---

[46] The instructions are printed in the account of one of the delegates: Leonhard Sudermann, *Eine Deputationsreise von Russland nach Amerika,* Elkhart, Indiana, 1897.

Upon their arrival in America, the delegates stopped first with their brethren in Pennsylvania and in Canada.[47] On the way to the western states they all came through Elkhart, Indiana, where they stayed with John F. Funk, the editor of the Mennonite periodicals, *Herald of Truth* and *Herold der Wahrheit.* Funk accompanied them on their trip and was to play an important role in the forthcoming immigration. Representatives of different railroad companies also went with the delegates and furnished lodging and transportation without charge.

The delegations separated to investigate different places. Some of them went to Texas, others to Kansas and Nebraska. Then they all came together at Fargo, Dakota, where they were met by Jacob Y. Schantz and W. Hespeler, the representative of the Canadian government. On behalf of his government Hespeler invited the entire group to come to Canada to investigate eight townships which the Canadian government had reserved for them. All the representatives and their friends left Fargo in one party for Winnipeg, at that time known as Fort Garry. Here they were received by the Attorney General and other state officials, after which they visited the reserved land in Manitoba.

The Canadian government was well prepared to receive the delegates and to meet their demands, thanks to the activities of Hespeler. A few months before their arrival in Manitoba, Hespeler had suggested to the Minister of Agriculture[48] that the government should be prepared to answer the questions of the delegates and to offer them the necessary inducements "in the shape of a written document direct from the government confirming the statements I verbally delivered to them last summer. . . . I therefore beg to propose that you should furnish me with credentials drawn out by you in a manner (signed and sealed) as they are in a habit of seeing such, stating the precise conditions the Canadian government has determined upon." It was important that the document should be ready on the arrival of the delegates, thus showing the sincerity of the Dominion government in its previous inducements.

At the time when the delegates proceeded to Ottawa the gov-

---

47 For information about the trip through America see also the very exhaustive diary of Paul Tschetter, one of the two Hutterite delegates, who writes in full detail about his observations, the places they visited and the conditions they found. The diary is edited by J. M. Hofer in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* Vol. V, No. 2 (April, 1931), pp. 112-127, and No. 3 (July, 1931), pp. 198-220. There is also on p. 219 a map showing the itinerary through America.

48 Hespeler's letter to the Minister of Agriculture of April 26, 1873, from Waterloo, Ontario, which he probably wrote after consultation with J. Y. Schantz.

ernment offered them a written assurance that their requests would be granted and that they might establish on the prairies of Manitoba the same type of settlements that they had in Russia. This document,[49] which was signed by the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, contained fifteen points:

(1) Entire exemption from military service;
(2) reservation of eight townships in the province of Manitoba for free grants of one-fourth section (160 acres) to any person who was the head of a family or had attained the age of 21 years;
(3) the reservation was made for the exclusive use of the Mennonites;
(4) should the settlement extend beyond the eight townships, more land would be reserved in the same way;
(5) the reserved eight townships might be exchanged for other townships;
(6) the right to buy the remaining three-fourths of the section at the price of one dollar per acre;
(7) a patent for a free grant would be given after three years' residence;
(8) in the event of the death of the settler the lawful heirs could claim the patent for the land;
(9) from the moment of occupation the settler acquired a "homestead right" in the land;
(10) "the fullest privilege of exercising their religious principles is by law afforded to the Mennonites without any kind of molestation or restriction whatever, and the same privilege extends to the education of their children in schools;"
(11) the privilege of affirming instead of making affidavits by oath;
(12) the government would furnish the passenger warrants from Hamburg to Fort Garry for families of good character at 30 dollars per person over the age of eight years, for persons under eight years, at 15 dollars, and for infants under one year, at 3 dollars;
(13) this arrangement as to the price would not be changed until 1876;
(14) if it should be changed thereafter the price should, until 1882, not exceed 40 dollars for an adult, and children in proportion;
(15) the immigrants would be furnished provisions on the portion of the journey between Liverpool and Collingwood.

[49] July 23, 1873, "relating to advantages offered to settlers and to the immunities afforded to Mennonites which are established by the statute law of Canada and by orders of His Excellency the Governor in Council for the information of German Mennonites having intention to emigrate to Canada via Hamburg." *United States Congressional Record,* 1874, Vol. 2, pt. 4, p. 3054.

This document is all the more important, because it added to the freedom from military service and the favorable land regulations the concession of the request of the delegates for the closed communities. As indicated above, this involved the privilege of exclusive settlement, and control of their schools, and thus affirmed the very fundamentals of their religious, moral and cultural life according to their convictions.

The Canadian government not only gave them promises for the future, but it also demonstrated its earnestness by paying the expenses which the delegates had incurred in travelling from Berdiansk, Russia, to Manitoba and back, totalling six hundred seventy dollars.[50]

Having been given such a friendly reception and such liberal concessions by the Canadian government, the delegates addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture a report of their proceedings and their views regarding settlement in Manitoba as follows:[51] "In accordance with your invitation to visit Canada and in particular the province of Manitoba, we have done so and in particular the eight townships which you have reserved for us for the purpose of settlement. We beg to say that we have found the said province to answer for our future homes and if it is the wish of God we will, joined by our colonists, go to Manitoba and make it our future home. Your liberal offers with which you are favoring us, we hope will turn out with the support of God beneficial to us and equally beneficial to the land of our adoption. We hope by next spring to begin the first immigration, in the probable number of 200 families. Should we, after the arrival of the first of our immigrants, think that another location than the present one which you have reserved for us would suit us better, then we hope that you will exchange the reserve to such parts as we should find preferable providing such parts should not by that time be taken up by other settlers or by the railways."

The splendid results accomplished by the Canadian delegates surpassed anything which was achieved in the United States. Whereas Canada met practically all the demands of the delegates,

---

50 *Department of Agriculture,* Ottawa, No. 8729, 1873. The government's consideration and report of its activities on the proposed Mennonite immigration is given in *Sessional Papers,* 1874, Vol. VI, No. 9. *Report of the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada for the Calendar Year of* 1873. *From the annual reports of the immigration agents,* pp. 11, 14.

51 *Department of Agriculture* (no date on copy used). This report is signed by the part of the delegation which decided to locate in Canada, namely David Classen, Jacob Peters, Heinrich Wiebe and Cornelius Toews.

the United States government gave assurance of very little. None of the privileges received from the Dominion Government were given them either by the states or by the national government.

This fact caused the delegates representing the Hutterite settlement, the ones who seemed to be the most anxious in securing a definite assurance from the Federal Government, to address a special petition to the President of the United States. In his abovementioned diary Paul Tschetter, one of the delegates, tells about their visit to President Grant, who was at that time spending a vacation on Long Island. Provided with a letter of introduction from Jay Cooke,[52] they had an audience with the President on July 27, 1873, and presented their petition. The representatives were accompanied by Mr. Hiller, the head of the land settlement department of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company.

This rather vigorous petition, addressed to the President of the United States, read:[53] "We, the delegates, appeal in this petition that in case there should be a war, that we should be free for at least 50 years from everything that concerns war, after 50 years we are willing to pay as all others. The other government expenses we are willing to help bear as well as other citizens. We wish to be as obedient children also to the government in all matters that are not against our conscience. But we cannot take part in anything that pertains to the military, and pray we may enjoy here in peace what in Russia we are exiled for. We also desire to know whether we may be permitted to form our colony in one community; and have our own German schools; whether we may control our own schools; whether we may establish our own form of local government in our colonies as it fits us, and whether we may be freed from the holding of office and also jury service and such like; and also whether we shall be free to vote or not . . . whether we may be freed from taking the oath and whether our yea or nay will be regarded as sufficient . . . and whether in case our consciences should be violated we might have the privilege of emigrating from America." Furthermore the petition requested information regarding the securing of government land. It stated that if the desired privileges were granted, their brethren would be encouraged to immigrate to America; if not, the immigration would be small as they would not wish to risk the dangers connected with immigration for something uncertain.

[52] Cooke was "one of the richest men in America," as Tschetter says, of the Cooke and Company banking firm which had invested heavily in the Union Pacific Railroad Company.

[53] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 72 f. The petition is dated July 26, 1873.

The President received the delegates in a most friendly manner and listened patiently to the explanation of the petition by Hiller, as he could not speak German,—a fact which surprised the delegates. He promised that an answer would be sent to them through Hiller.

The reply of the Federal government which reached the delegates a few weeks after their return to Russia was given by Secretary of State Hamilton Fish to whom the petition had been referred.[54] He stated that since practically all their wishes concerned matters which fell under the jurisdiction of the various states in which they wished to settle, the President could not "exempt them from the laws of the states and the laws to which other citizens are subject." As to the exemption from paying substitute money for fifty years, that too is beyond his power of promising. "It is true, however, that for the next fifty years we will not be entangled in another war in which military service will be necessary. But should it be necessary there is little likelihood that Congress would find justification for freeing them from duties which are asked of other citizens."

Thus, as is seen from this document, the Federal Government did not give any promises to the delegates which would entitle them to special privileges. But on the whole, the delegations sent to America were favorably impressed by what they had seen, and the general conclusion of the inquiry was that the emigration was to be very much recommended. They found enough land in different states for their purposes and on easy terms and only seemed to disagree on the question as to what regions were to be preferred.

Although little encouragement was given to the delegates by the national authorities, the states were very active in trying to get their uncultivated land areas settled with good farmers. The governments of the frontier states tried to induce the immigrants to settle on their lands by acts of legislation. As soon as the question had come up, the state of Minnesota had in 1872 invited the Mennonites to settle there. The legislatures of Kansas, Nebraska and Minnesota passed laws within the following years, exempting the Mennonites from military service.

The main factor, however, which promoted and induced the Mennonite immigration to the United States was the colonization campaign of the railroad companies. Encouraged by the govern-

---

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 73 f. The answer, dated Washington, September 5, 1873, was addressed to Hiller, as the delegates had left by that time, and was by him transmitted to them.

ment to build railroads through the country, the companies had been granted in return strips of prairie land along the railroad right of way. These they hoped to settle with immigrant farmers and thus to secure to a certain extent the interest on the capital invested in their undertakings. The unfavorable conditions of the early seventies aggravated the situation seriously, and brought some of the railroad companies to the verge of bankruptcy.[55]

Under these circumstances the proposed immigration of a large number of thrifty farmers caused a keen rivalry among the different railroad companies, especially the Northern Pacific, Atlantic Pacific, St. Paul and Pacific, Union Pacific, Santa Fe, and Rock Island.

The interest and the activities of the railroads may be illustrated by the activity of the Santa Fe Company, which tried to get settlers for the land adjacent to their newly constructed railway in Kansas. Its land commissioner, C. B. Schmidt,[56] had accompanied Cornelius Jansen, who had been expelled from Russia for his emigration activities, on his investigation trip through Kansas and Nebraska. Schmidt showed the delegations the land of the Company. Being a German, he soon gained the confidence of these people and kept in close contact with their emigration movement. In order to induce the German colonists from South Russia to come to Kansas he later made a visit to their settlements in Russia.[57] Hiller of the Northern Pacific later was also sent to South Russia to get colonists for his company's lands.

Because they needed settlers badly, the railroads attempted to meet the demands of the Mennonites which the state and national governments had failed to meet. This is best illustrated by the contract made between the delegation and the Northwestern Pacific Company. This contract provided for the reservation of a large tract of land in Dakota along the Red River which the dele-

---

[55] Among others was the Union Pacific, in which the largest banking firm of the day, Jay Cooke and Company, had invested large capital, the returns of which amounted to practically nothing.

[56] For details see Schmidt's little pamphlet, *Reminiscences of Kansas Immigration Work* (in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen, Indiana).

[57] Provided with letters of recommendation from Russian Mennonites already settled in Kansas, Schmidt left for Europe in February, 1875, and visited first the Mennonites near Danzig. From this region later a large number emigrated to Kansas. Then he went on to South Russia, visiting for a whole month one colony after the other in the Molotschna district, where he made contacts with the influential leaders and tried to persuade them to come to Kansas. To that end he promised them that a law should be enacted in Kansas exempting the Mennonites from military service and from taking oath. He found a welcome reception everywhere. Soon, however, his activities were closely watched by the police and therefore he thought it best to leave Russia.

gates had found suitable for colonization by their people in case the terms should be accepted. In a letter addressed to the chairman of the land committee of the Northern Pacific, the delegates made suggestions of their desires which they wished taken into consideration in regard to their settlement in the Red River Valley.[58]

According to the contract, the company would

(1) reserve from sale until March 1, 1874 all its lands on both sides of the railroad in Dakota territory within fifty miles of the Red River. By that date the Mennonite communities should notify the company whether they would settle on the line of the Northern Pacific;

(2) the company excluded from this reservation the site of Fargo on the Red River and such other land adjacent to the right of way as might be needed for its purposes;

(3) the lands finally selected should be held in reserve for five years from July 1, 1878, provided that ten percent of the whole land should be bought each year;

(4) the price of the reserved land should average three dollars per acre;

(5) the communities should have, at the expiration of the four years, the option of returning under certain conditions all unsold lands, provided that at least fifty percent of all the reserved land was sold;

(6) if they, at the end of five years, wished not to return unsold lands, they should be allowed additional time;

(7) the conditions of payment were: ten percent in cash, ten percent in one year, ten percent in two years, ten percent in three years, fifteen percent in four years, fifteen percent in five years, fifteen percent in six years, and fifteen percent in seven years, at seven percent interest;

(8) the communities were allowed to so select the lands that one of each four townships should be traversed by the railroad;

(9) the company would locate the necessary stations at convenient points, paying due regard to the wishes of the colonists;

(10) the company guaranteed to the colonists absolute control and ownership of the towns, villages or cities occupied by them, free from any interference by or control of any other organization. It would not permit any organization outside of the Mennonite communities to purchase company lands and lay out towns thereon within the limits of the colony reservation;

(11) the company would provide to the communities free of cost a suitable lot for church and school and would at all times and in all proper ways cordially coöperate with the colonists in promoting the interests of education, morality and good order within the limits of their reservation;

---

58 Both manuscript documents are in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen, Indiana. The letter of the delegates, dated at New York, August 20, 1873, is signed by W. Ewert, Leonhard Sudermann, Jacob Butter and Andrew Schrag. The contract is signed by the president of the Northern Pacific, G. W. Cass, and by Frederick Billings, the chairman of the land committee, August 20, 1873.

(12) the company would likewise provide for the colonists a sufficient number of suitably created and properly furnished reception houses;

(13) during the first three years following March 1, a reduction of ten percent would be given to the colonists from the regular freight tariff of the Northern Pacific;

(14) the company would aid the colonists in procuring cheap fuel by transporting it at reduced rates of freight and would make efforts to keep the cost of fuel for the colonists permanently low;

(15) the company would supervise the reception of the colonists on their arrival from Europe as well as their comfortable conduct to the colony stations, and provide transportation at the lowest attainable rates;

(16) for the railroad fare of the colonists from St. Paul or Duluth to their stations, which should be paid in cash, the company would issue coupons which they might return in payment for lands bought by them from the company;

(17) the company would grant free season passes to six persons chosen by the communities, during a period of three years from July 1, 1874;

(18) it would aid the colonists in promoting any legal or just measure for securing the government lands within their reservation;

(19) on the request of the Mennonites, the company recognized Hiller as their agent.

Thus it is seen that the Northern Pacific tried its best to provide for the Mennonites the possibility to establish their exclusive closed settlements. Likewise the other railroads were interested in having these colonists settle on their lands rather than in Canada.

Public opinion took great interest in the proposed immigration, and the newspapers were very active in advocating the case of the Germans from Russia. Typical is an article in the *Illinois Staatszeitung*[59] which gives a detailed account of the situation. It urges the settlement of the Mennonites in the northwestern states of the Union where they easily could have great influence on legislation or where they could form their own state as a member of the Union and establish their own government.

There was, however, one obstacle to overcome upon which the settlement in the United States in general and the fulfillment of the contract with the Northern Pacific in particular was dependent and without which "the entire plan would be a failure," as the delegates stated. The land tracts had been granted to the railroads by the Federal Government in such a way as to alternate with government land. If therefore the main purpose, the establishment of closed settlements, was to be attained it was necessary that such govern-

---

[59] *Illinois Staatszeitung,* July, 1873, reprinted in the *Friedensbote,* July 15, 1873.

ment lands between the railroad reservations would be withdrawn from public entry and reserved for these colonists. This, however, could only be made possible through the passage of a special act by Congress with the aim of securing for the colonists these government lands.

The western states and the railroads, prodded by their economic interests as well as by the Mennonites of America, who wished to help their Russian Brethren, started to work through their representatives in Congress to bring about the necessary legislation for the withdrawal of the desired lands from public entry.

As early as December 8, 1873, a petition signed by J. F. Funk of Elkhart, Indiana, and Amos Herr of Lancaster, Pennsylvania, was presented to the House of Representatives by A. Herr Smith, Congressman from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, the same petition being presented to the House by Congressmen Lowe of Kansas, Monroe of Ohio, and Dunnel of Minnesota.[60] On February 24, 1874, a bill was introduced into the House of Representatives by Smith of Pennsylvania, was read the first and second time, and was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.[61] Nothing concerning it was heard until April 1st, when Clymer of Pennsylvania, on behalf of the Committee on Public Lands, presented a substitute bill on the ground that "if legislation is to be had at all it should be had promptly."[62] But nothing was done.

More attention, however, was given to the cause of the Mennonites by the Senate. On January 12, 1874, a similar petition was presented to the Senate by Senator Cameron of Pennsylvania which was signed by "some of the immigrants from Russia and Prussia called Mennonites."[63] After giving the reasons for leaving Russia, they stated that if they should purchase land from the railroads, "some of the sections belonging to the Government would be taken up by persons who do not belong to our colony and who are not in sympathy with us. Besides this, our mode of farming is for fifteen or twenty families to join together on a large tract of land and to have portions of it set aside for common pasture, where all the horses and cattle may graze together, kept by one herder." In behalf of their brethren numbering between 40,000 and 50,000,

---

60 *Congressional Record,* 1873, Vol. II, pt. 1, p. 100.

61 *Ibid.,* 1874, Vol. II, pt. 2, p. 1730. On February 5, Crounse of Nebraska had presented the same petition (*Ibid.,* p. 1212).

62 *Ibid.,* 1874, Vol. II, pt. 3, p. 2689. The reason for this was that the Mennonites had already begun to arrive from Russia.

63 *Ibid.,* 1874, Vol. II, pt. 1, p. 570.

they asked, (1) that if they would select portions of railroad lands in different places suitable to their different wants as cattle raisers, agriculturists, they be allowed to take up and secure the sections of government lands lying adjacent thereto, either by purchase or under the homestead law, and preserve the same until the year 1887; and (2) If they would find bodies of unoccupied land belonging to the government suited to their purposes, that they be allowed the same privileges of taking up and securing a sufficient quantity of land protected from the interference of outside parties.

As the petitioners were foreigners, Senator Ferry of Connecticut objected to the reception of the petition, until Senator Cameron presented it in his own name as petitioner and it was thus read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

On April 2, Senator Windom of Minnesota, a stockholder of the Northern Pacific, introduced the "bill (No. 655) to enable the Mennonites from Russia to effect permanent settlement on public lands of the United States."[64] The bill was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands. Amended by that Committee, the bill was reported out on April 7, and defended before the Senate on April 14 by Senator Windom.[65]

In recommending the bill Senator Windom said that it had received unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Public

---

[64] *Ibid.*, 1874, Vol. II, pt. 3, p. 2718.

[65] *Ibid.* 1874, Vol. II, pt. 4, p. 3054. The bill reads as follows: "That whenever a body of such persons being heads of families or single persons over twenty-one years of age shall through a duly constituted and accredited agent file with the Secretary of the Interior an application for permission to locate a portion of the public lands of the United States accompanying such application with a list of the persons composing such body and the quantity desired by each, the Secretary may authorize such location to be made in any land district of the United States, by giving such agent the proper certificate in writing, under seal of his office, stating that such application has been filed, and reciting the number of persons so applying and the number of acres which they may include in their claim, and location to be made as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. That upon presentation of the certificate aforesaid to any district such agent as aforesaid shall be permitted to locate in a compact body any tract of unappropriated public land not mineral and not exceeding the amount of 160 acres held at the minimum price, or 80 acres held at the double minimum price, for each person composing such body of individuals named in the said petition and application, provided that no prior right of any person under existing laws shall be prejudiced by this act.

Sec. 3. That such location shall be made by filing with the register a declaratory statement describing the lands by sectional subdivision, township and range, and the payment to the receiver of fees at the rate of one dollar each to the register and receiver for each 160 acres embraced in the application, to be accounted for as other fees and allowances, and subject to the restrictions under existing laws as to maximum compensation of those officers. And upon receipt

Lands and that the Mennonites were found to be "industrious, intelligent and in every respect the class of people most desired in this country." He read before the Senate the privileges granted July 23, 1873, by the Canadian Government, and pointed out that Canada was extremely anxious to obtain these settlers. But "they prefer our country and unless we choose to drive away forty thousand of the very best farmers of Russia who are now competing with us in the markets of the world with some ten million bushels of their wheat, if we choose to say that Russia shall raise that wheat or that Canada shall provide it instead of our own country, we can simply reject the proffer of these people and they probably will not become our citizens. I deem it of the utmost importance that this bill should pass."

However, the bill caused a long discussion. It was strongly opposed by Senator Edmonds of Vermont on the ground that it was not so much the question of these particular people but one which touches the foundation of American civilization and the principle of democracy. "I do not think that American history has furnished a precedent for a bill of this character. I do not believe that it ever occurred to the founders of this government . . . that

---

of such fees the receiver shall issue his receipt therefor setting forth the fact of such declaratory statement having been filed, giving the number of the same, and the description of the land, and acknowledging the said payment of the fees as aforesaid; which receipt shall be delivered to such agent and shall be his voucher for the filing of the declaratory statement and payment of the fees aforesaid.

Sec. 4. That the register shall forward to the general land office as a portion of his monthly returns, a duly certified abstract of the declaratory statement in the same manner as similar returns are rendered in preemption cases, to be entered upon the books of the general land office.

Sec. 5. That any person named in the application and petition on file with the Secretary of the Interior, or, if he be dead, his representatives, shall have the exclusive right of entry for the period of two years from the date of filing as aforesaid under the laws of the United States existing at the date of entry, of a tract of land embraced in said declaratory statement not exceeding 160 acres of minimum or 80 acres of double minimum lands.

Sec. 6. That all questions of priority, arising between actual settlers shall be adjusted under existing rules.

Sec. 7. That at the expiration of the period of two years as aforesaid, all lands not entered by the parties entitled under the foregoing provisions, shall be subject to the entry of any other person under the laws applicable to the same as other public lands of the United States.

Sec. 8. That the aggregate of lands held under declaratory statements as aforesaid shall not at any one time exceed 500,000 acres, nor shall any one filing embrace more than 100,000 acres.

Sec. 9. That the commissioner of the general land office shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations to carry into effect the provisions of this act."

the highest public policy . . . of the Republic would tolerate a species of legislation of this character. To me it is a question entirely independent of what these people may think upon any religious or political or social topic. It is the question which as I believe is fundamental to successful republicanism, that of a homogeneous unity of the whole body of the citizens of a state . . . but all in the body of the community living as friends and neighbors among each other, and not separated by any territorial or other distinctions from each other." However tempting the opportunity to get fifty thousand wheat raisers and wool growers, one should not be tempted by any advantage to depart from the fundamental principle. He says, "Let us have no exclusions, let us have no boundaries, let us be a nation and a people where every man everywhere stands on an equality with his fellowman, where there are no boundaries like Chinese walls to separate one sect or one opinion of politics or one calling from another, but an equal citizenship and an equal freedom."[66]

While one main feature of the proposed settlement, the closed communities, was being opposed by the Senator from Vermont, the provision for freedom from military service was also being criticized by Senator Ferry of Connecticut, who ardently opposed the passage of the bill. He raised the question of the settlement of the Mennonites without becoming citizens of the United States and without becoming liable to compulsory military service. "I am of the opinion that we never ought to establish the precedent of admitting colonies from abroad within our territory with a direct or indirect provision in the law admitting them by which they should be exempted from the defense of our own common country." Unless the bill would be amended in that respect and a provision inserted in it that "before their title to these lands shall become perfect they shall become naturalized citizens of the United States, no Mennonite will come to our shores."[67]

In reply to this there were among the defenders (in addition to Senator Windom) the Senators Cameron and Scott of Pennsylvania and Pratt of Indiana.

In his defense Cameron said: "We have a very large number of these people in Pennsylvania. They are among the best of our citizens. They are nearly all farmers. Their farms are the most highly cultivated of all our lands in Pennsylvania and I think our

[66] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pt. 4, p. 3055.
[67] *Ibid.*, p. 3057.

lands are as well cultivated as any that I have seen in any part of the world. . . . They never interfere with anybody; they pay their debts and they take care of their own poor. In time of war, whenever they are called upon, they pay such taxes as the Government asks of them. . . . They were all loyal and faithful to the government. So entirely are they believed to be honest that they can borrow money anywhere without any security. They are a thrifty, laborious, saving people. Now they are cultivating a school system. There is not a township in the counties in which they reside but has got a large number of schoolhouses of the best kind, with all the advantages which science has furnished to those who now build schoolhouses. They are hospitable. You can not go to their houses without receiving a portion of what they have, and they never charge anybody for the entertainment which they furnish. I do not believe there is a better class of people in the world than are the German Mennonites."[68]

In the same tone of praise spoke Senator Scott about the Mennonites as well as the Tunkers and the "Ahmische" (sic!) of his region. "For thrift, industry, economy, integrity and good morals, they are not exceeded by any other class of the population in that or any other state of this Union. They are not either, as is sometimes asserted, a laggard people in substantial improvement, for within recent years many of them have exhibited a spirit of enterprise and a desire for the intellectual advancement of their people as great as that of almost any other religious denomination. . . . They are encouraging newspapers and establishing institutions of learning. If there is any class of people, Mr. President, whom we should encourage to come to our shores by any legislation in consonance with our general policy in reference to the public lands, it cannot be extended in any direction with more advantage to our public interests than by encouraging the Mennonites to settle among us."[69]

On April 16th the bill was again considered in the Senate, the main object being the amount of land to be set aside. Except details concerning this object nothing was discussed.[70]

---

[68] *Ibid.*, pp. 3057, 3058. Then tracing back into the history of the United States he showed that in the early times the settlements were made everywhere by colonies and it was natural that the Mennonites desire to found their own colonies. "Wherever they go they will be a blessing to the neighborhood in which they think proper to settle."

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 3058.

[70] *Ibid.*, pp. 3110-3112.

On April 22, Senator Pratt of Indiana, in answering Senator Stewart, said: "This, to be sure, is an exceptional legislation, but the occasion for it is exceptional, and the opportunity which this country has of acquiring a large and very valuable body of emigrants to this country is an exceptional opportunity, and we are very likely to lose this immigration unless we pass this measure or something similar to it." As they lived in compact bodies in Europe and were attached to their religion and customs and habits of life, it was natural that they wanted to live in compact bodies in the United States. "There is no worthier class of people upon the face of the globe. . . . Certainly, there is no more valuable class of immigrants that have come or will come to this country than these Mennonites."[71]

Thereupon Senator Carpenter of Wisconsin stated the reasons why he would vote against the bill, which he thought was a "very bad bill in principle. . . . It is certainly a new departure in our policy of settling this country. We have heretofore acted upon the theory that people of all nations might find their home with us, that we would furnish to all the same facilities and that they should be distributed among and commingled with our people. . . . But the design of their bill is to create a close corporation, to plant a foreign colony, and to establish a compact foreign community in our body politic. Mr. President, such a proceeding can, it seems to me, bear no fruits but evil. It is setting a precedent which we must follow hereafter. When other nationalities ask us to do the same thing. . . . We do not desire to have a town or a county settled by any foreign nationality, speaking their own language, having their national amusements, and in all things separated and different from Americans. The idea is and should be, and it should never be departed from, that in inviting foreigners to settle in this country they should take their place with our citizens, they should come here not to be Germans or Frenchmen or Italians, but to be Americans, to become American citizens, to speak our language, to support our institutions, to be of us in all things. Now certainly the greatest obstacle in the way of this result would be to give the different nationalities a separate and distinct location as their bill proposes to do."[72]

Continuing the debate next day, Senator Thurman of Ohio thought that the bill proposed "a new kind of preemption that

---

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 3263, 3264.

[72] *Ibid.*, p. 3264. Senator Stockton of New Jersey agreed with this, looking upon the bill as "a very bad one, a very dangerous one and one without precedent."

never yet has existed in this country. . . . The Mennonites are a very worthy set of people, but is that a reason why we should change the whole land policy of the Government from the time we inaugurated a policy at all on the subject? And if we pass this bill because they are worthy people, can we refuse to pass similar bills whenever other people ask us to do so? If this policy be adopted it will open a door to the most outrageous frauds."[73]

Senator Sargent of California was also opposed to this legislation. If the bill passes "we are encouraging within our borders for the first time in our history colonies of persons in a degree separated from the rest of our people, with their own customs, their own religion, their own ways of life brought from their native countries, and isolated in our midst like islands in the ocean. Our policy has been heretofore to invite the people of all countries desiring a home into our midst and our laws have been sufficiently liberal for their acquisition of homes throughout our broad domain where the government of the United States had land to give them or to sell at low prices. By means of that system there was a general distribution of these people; they separated up into families, scattered into different communities, had many points of contact with our customs and language. They had an opportunity by isolation from each other and by combination with our people to learn readily our language, to understand gradually our institutions; and the result has been that if not in the first generation—though it was often so in the first—in the second generation they were throughly Americanized, and it has been a most valuable lifeblood infused into the body politic. — But, Sir, if you reverse this and put colonies of twenty and thirty thousand people in a single place, occupying two or three hundred thousand acres in a community, they have not this opportunity either for intermarriage — they marry among themselves for natural preferences — or to learn our language because they converse among themselves in their own

---

[73] He thought "it is very easy, if this thing is to be done, for sharp and designing men, when it is once found that Congress will pass such laws, to come here representing themselves as entitled to represent large bodies of immigrants coming to this country and asking the passage of precisely similar bills; and how are you to refuse them? Are you going to refuse them upon the ground that their sect of religion is not as good as the Mennonites or that you do not quite agree with their sentiments in morals or politics or something else? Are we to have an investigation into the character and opinions of the immigrants? Are we to have a religious or a moral or a philosophical or an economical test set up whenever such grants are asked for? . . . I think that any policy which tends to monopolize those lands in large tracts is not advantageous to the people of the country nor to the immigrants to the country, and is against the best interests of the government." (*Ibid.*, p. 3299 f.)

language; or to learn our customs, for they do not lose their own. They get no intelligent idea of our institutions because they have not that contact with the general body of the public, which is necessary insensibly to infuse into their minds the knowledge and the spirit of the American form of government. I think that this is an unwise departure from a system which has worked well heretofore and to my mind it is the principal objection to this bill. . . . A principal reason is that these persons are aggregated together, are set down in communities by themselves, they are not American citizens, they will not become American citizens in the true sense of the term. They are Mennonites, or if they were of some other nation, they would be Irish, they would be Germans, they would not be Americans,— I shall vote against the bill."[74]

To that Senator Tipton of Nebraska replied that he was much in favor of the bill and opposed the notion that the Mennonites would not make good citizens or that they were against bearing arms. "If there is any portion of the world that can send us a few advocates of peace — in God's name let us bid them welcome."[75]

The bill was not passed, as it could not obtain a vote on April 23, the final day for the discussion, nor could a unanimous consent for an extension of time to discuss the proposed measure be received. It was shelved and never brought up again, for should it be of any use to the Mennonites, it had to become law immediately. But, as was repeatedly pointed out during the debates by the supporters, the Mennonites already had started to leave Russia.

After the return of the delegates from America to Russia, there began, in the fall of 1873, a great agitation among the colonists for emigration into the United States and Canada.[76] It was no more a matter of individuals, but a popular and mass movement. Not only were the Mennonites interested in emigration, but large settlements of other German colonists in the Volga and in the Ukraine as well, numbering several hundred thousands. Many of these were eager to join the Mennonites in leaving for America.

---

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 3300. He continued: "I had an opportunity to meet some of them (the Mennonites) a few months ago, and talk with them. I found that these persons, who probably were selected from the whole body of the company, were men of very high intelligence, and they seemed to speak the English language with considerable purity and I have no doubt that if they are anything near representatives of the class of people that sent them here it will be a valuable acquisition to the Republic to have them come among us, but not to have them come as a community isolated from the rest of the body politic."

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 3300.

[76] Small groups left Russia for America even before the return of the delegates to their colonies.

Even other national groups were seriously considering leaving Russia.[77] The Russian Government recognized that Russia was threatened with the loss of her best tillers who had made the Ukraine the "granary of Europe," and to whom she owed her competition in the world's grain market. Russia's economic body could not withstand such a severe shock, the consequences of which might seriously affect her economic structure, if the Black Sea region was to be depopulated of its best agriculturists. On the other hand, the topic of emigration had been so much publicized both in Europe and in America that it had attracted to a considerable extent, the attention of the Russian Government and people.

Characteristic of public opinion in Russia was an article in the *Russian World* which indicates the attitude not of an extremist paper but of a liberal one that tried to do justice to both sides. The article was written after the news was spread that the Mennonites had sent deputies to the American and British consuls.[78] At first the Russians had paid little heed to the emigration movement, but seeing its early achievements they became fearful of losing their German agriculturists. The article discussed at length the new law requiring the colonists to perform military service as the cause of this "hardly probable movement which threatens to depopulate the richest lands and settlements in the South of Russia." If the Mennonites could not reconcile themselves to the new order of things, it would be better for Russia to deprive herself of these inhabitants than to infringe the principle of the equality of all the subjects in their obligations toward the state. It was strange, it said, that the Mennonites should insist on privileges which were given to them at the time of their colonization. "Treaties are always written forever, but time runs on, conditions change that existed at the conclusion of the treaties, and this destroys the treaties. If the government consents to the exemption of the Mennonites and other German colonists from military service, it should then immediately dissolve the new military commission. If it admits

---

77 There were Bulgarian colonies in Bessarabia, who presented a petition to return to Turkey, which was then a subject of negotiation between the Turkish and Russian Governments. (*American Embassy to the Department of State. Despatch No.* 171 *of April* 6, 1872. *Department of State, Despatches, Russia.*) A very large proportion of the Tartar population in Southern Russia also expressed its desire to leave either for Turkey or Germany. The government at once sent them to General Woronzow, the former governor of Odessa, who spoke Tartar and was popular among them. He succeeded in time in dissuading them from emigrating (*Department of State, Despatches, Russia. No.* 77, *of May* 20, 1872.)

78 *Russkij Mir,* in Russian, March 24, 1872. *Russkij Mir* (1872-1880) was since 1880 edited under the title *Birshevve Vedo Mosti,* and was an influential Russian paper.

the right of the German colonists to exemption from military service, it so much the more admits the right to the same exemption of the Russian nobility, mercantile class, etc. Charters were granted to all by the one and self same power. It is better to lose the Mennonites than to introduce into the state the inequality of rights and that too in favor of foreigners and not of the native population." This certainly was the sentiment of the large majority of the Russian population and of the Russian government.

Therefore when the emigration was no longer to be doubted and the preparations for it began on a large scale by selling lands and property, the Russian government had seriously to consider the means and steps to be taken to prevent the impending loss. Every hindrance that could possibly be found was placed in the way of the emigrants whether in the selling of their property, or in the getting of passports for which they paid as much as fifty to eighty dollars a piece. The censorship, always so powerful in Russian history, tried to intercept mails from foreign countries. Cornelius Jansen, Prussian Consul at Berdiansk, who was regarded as the first agitator, was expelled from Russia. He went to America and, as shown heretofore, continued his activities in favor of the immigration of his coreligionists. Mention should also be made of the propaganda initiated in the colonies by the Russian Government, which portrayed the disadvantages of the proposed undertaking. News was spread that the Mennonites would not receive the expected privileges in the United States.[79]

---

[79] A song was widely used as propaganda by the Russian government which had been sent home to Russia from America by a disappointed emigrant. (*Zur Heimat,* November 1, 1879.):

1. Freunde, bleibt nur hübsch im Lande
Und ernährt euch redlich dort.
Im amerikanischen Lande
Kommt Ihr noch weit schlechter fort.
Die Sonne auf den Pelz euch brennt,
Plagen, die Ihr dort nicht kennt,
Regnen hier auf Euch herab,
Und das Geld ist hier erst knapp.

2. Liess mich leider auch verleiten,
Zog mit Weib und Kind hier hin.
Tausend Meilen musst ich schreiten,
Tat's mit unverdrossnem Sinn;
Hoffte in Amerika
Sei im Wollen alles da,
Rittergüter klein und gross
Nehm ein jeder sich nur bloss.

3. Ach, wie soll ich euch's doch schildern
Meine Täuschung, meine Not?
Bei den schön geträumten Bildern
Fehlte mir das liebe Brot,
Kläglich auf der Reise schon
Starb mein lieber kleiner Sohn,
Und mein Weib erkrankte noch,
Zu schwer war ihr Reise-Joch.

4. Als nach Bremen wir gekommen
Waren wir von Kummer bleich.
Alles was wir mitgenommen
Zahlten für die Fahrt wir gleich.
Und die Zehrung in dem Ort
Nahm den letzten Pfennig fort,
Nackt und kahl wie'n Felsenriff
Stiegen wir hinein ins Schiff.

5. Eingepresst in engen Räumen
Lagen wir zu Hundert da;
Heimgesucht von argen Träumen
Wähnten wir die Hilfe nah.
Hunger, Durst und Uebelkeit,
Ungeziefer wie geschneit,
Quälten uns bei Tag und Nacht,
Hatten fast uns umgebracht.

6. Endlich nach viel trüben Tagen
Sturm, Verzweiflung, Ungemach,
Schien die Rettungsstund zu schlagen,
Nahte der Erlösungstag.
Fröhlich jauchzend rief man da:
"Wir sind in Amerika!"
Und die enggepresste Brust
Hob sich vor erneuter Lust.

The difficulties became such a hindrance and were so numerous that coreligionists and friends of the Mennonites wrote from Germany to the American Ambassador in St. Petersburg, asking for his assistance in the matter. They stated that while the Russian government had ordered their officials to grant the Mennonites the necessary passports, yet the officials threw every possible impediment in their way causing the emigrants loss of time and money.[80]

But nothing could stem the movement, so strongly initiated. Next the government tried to retain the Mennonites in Russia by promising the privileges which they heretofore enjoyed, if they would settle in the valley of the Amur River in the Far East. There was even a commission of three Mennonite representatives sent at the expense of the government to investigate the land in the Amur region. But the colonists no longer believed in the granting and keeping of privileges by Russia, so this offer did not change their mind.

A last attempt was made by the government. General von Todtleben, who was of German extraction and spoke German fluently, and as a hero of the Crimean war was very popular, was sent to the Mennonites.[81] He was instructed to find out their difficulties and to ascertain what concessions the government should make to them in order to prevent their emigration. In the name

---

7. Statt uns freundlich zu empfangen
Wie wir töricht es gedacht,
Wurden mit den bleichen Wangen
Wir noch tapfer ausgelacht.
Ach, es weiss der liebe Gott
Wie vor lauter Hohn und Spott
Unser armes Herz zerbrach
Manchen, manchen sauern Tag.

8. Was beginnen, was nun treiben
In dem unbekannten Land,
Wo gezwungen wir zu bleiben
Niemand fast ein Obdach fand?
Ja, fast unsere Augen blind
Haben wir mit Weib und Kind
Nach der Heimat ausgesehen,
Doch das Unglück war geschehen.

9. Endlich trafen wir noch Herzen
Aus dem trauten Vaterland
Die erweicht von unsern Schmerzen
Reichten uns die Bruderhand.
Doch ist unsre Arbeit schwer
Und—Gott weiss—die Tasche leer.
Auch ist unser Trank und Schmauss
Nicht so gut als wie zu Haus.

10. Freunde, lasst euch dringend sagen:
Bleibt in Eurem Heimatland!
Und ertragt mit Mut die Plagen
Die Euch einmal schon bekannt!
Glaubt nur, in Amerika.
Sind noch gröss're Leiden da,
Und wer Lust zur Arbeit hat
Isst sich auch zu Hause satt.

11. Aber die Natur zu dämpfen
Gilt es ein gar schweres Kämpfen,
Ohn ein rechtes, gründlich Prüfen
Tut man sich zur Reis' entschliessen,
Ohne dass man Gott tut fragen
Der den besten Rat doch weiss,
Greift man zu den grossen Plagen
Und nennt es noch Gottes Geist,
Der uns führt zu diesem Ziel,
Und so geht es ihrer viel.

12. Diese Reiselust zu dämpfen
Ist ein gründlich Prüfen not,
Denn ein gar zu spätes Kämpfen
Führt zuletzt in Not und Tod,
Ohne dass man Gott drum frägt
Und die Sach wohl überlegt.
Wag' es niemand, so wie ich,
Sonst bereut er's jämmerlich.

80 *Department of State. Despatches.* Vol. XXVI, No. 77. St. Petersburg, May 20, 1874.

81 General von Todtleben was "perhaps the most influential and proper man to be found in the Empire to confer with the Mennonites." (*Ibid.*)

of the Czar he was to offer them as a substitute for the compulsory military service, the promise that they were to be employed only in sanitary and hospital occupations. This mission was expected to influence at least the liberal-minded and especially the younger generation of the Mennonites.

The *St. Petersburg Zeitung,* a usually well informed and influential paper, carried a long article on the matter.[82] The emigration movement, it said, which was of an almost unreasonable character, was having its reaction in that the more reasonable elements among the Mennonites, the laymen and the younger generation, were winning more and more ground. They were unwilling to let the decision lie with the stubbornness of the conservatives and elders, who would not make any concessions to the "Zeitgeist" and its demands. They were ready to examine under what conditions a compromise could be reached and how the modification of the military law could be accepted. In the general interest of the country it was to be hoped that the Mennonites could be kept in Russia. "As an agricultural population they are not to be underestimated. And every time a state loses such it loses not the worst elements of the population, but an element full of character and life, namely those sects and parties which for the sake of their conscience sacrifice their soil." Under these circumstances the mission of General von Todtleben gained in importance and prospect of success.

In fact the visit of General von Todtleben did not fail, and the majority of the Mennonites accepted the new provisions made in the military law. In his interesting report to the Minister of the Interior of April 30, 1874, Todtleben gave a minute account of the conditions he found in the colonies in the course of his negotiations with the Mennonites during his two weeks stay in April, 1874.[83] He stated that there were three groups: (1) the ones who had sold their land and other property and were encouraged either by fanatics from among their own people or by foreign agitators; (2) those who either separated from their fanatical coreligionists and wished to stay in Russia but did not dare confess their intention frankly, or followed them blindly in the conviction to save in that way the faith of their forefathers — this was the largest single group; and (3) those, composing a small group, who wished to stay in Russia in

---

[82] *St. Petersburg Zeitung,* in the German language, April 26, (May 8), 1874.

[83] The report is fully reprinted in an article by A. Velizyn: "The German colonies in South Russia," in the Russian magazine *Russkii Vicstnik,* February, 1890, p. 285 ff.

any case, who encouraged their brethren to leave with the object of buying cheap land and homes.

Todtleben told how in conferences which were attended by the elders and teachers and other leaders, he painted the disadvantages and hardships of the emigration, and the difficulties in building up their homes in a new country.[84] On the other hand he pictured the advantages of the new offer he was ready to make them on behalf of the Czar, namely that military service in time of peace and of war would be replaced by a substitute service in forests and hospitals where the carrying of arms was out of the question and where the administration of the service was even disconnected with the war ministry authorities.

With these provisions the majority at last agreed and decided to stay in Russia. In a petition handed to General von Todtleben they expressed their gratitude to the Czar and their special wishes in connection with the new regulation. They asked among other things for the privilege of the use of the German language in their educational system, of the autonomous supervision of their schools, and for the free right to emigrate in the future in case the military law should be changed.[85]

In addition to the general conferences, a special conference was held by General von Todtleben with those who had already disposed of their property, had sold their homes and had filed their applications for passports to go to the United States. Todtleben explained the purpose of his mission and with great tact offered the return of their applications for release from Russian citizenship to those who would stay in Russia. But in reply to this they brought him a petition asking for his support in getting permission to leave, stating that any connection whatsoever with or even indirect contribution to the military service was against their religious belief. As there was no chance to discourage them, Todtleben did not make any more efforts, as this might have unfavorably impressed the remaining part.

In the meanwhile the preparations for the departure were made with whirlwind intensity. Means for transportation had to be procured and the property had to be disposed of. The offer for sale of land and other property was at once very extensive. As

---

84 Among other things he told them that they could not be sure of exemption from military service in America where during the Civil War Mennonites had to do their duty.

85 This last provision, they explained, was made only out of consideration for the generations to come.

some of the communities decided to emigrate in a body, whole villages with well established homes were offered for sale. The fact that thousands of families tried to dispose of their property practically all at the same time, had a very unfavorable influence on the marketability of land and property. The result was that the prices fell sharply on everything they had to sell. To further complicate matters many of the colonies had been founded on so-called crown land, where the ownership was restricted.

But nothing could hold those who once had decided to emigrate, so in spite of everything they left.

As early as the summer of 1873 quite a number of families had arrived in America, but it was not until the summer of 1874 that the big rush started with the departure of large colonies. In May, 1874, 595 persons arrived in American ports. The highest monthly number of the year was reached in July — 1936 persons, then it declined in August to 800, in September to 335, in October to 175. In November it rose again to 1257 and reached 1300 in December. The total for the year 1874 was 6,402 persons.[86]

The immigrants came to America in large groups and consisted in many cases of entire communities. There were a few individuals from other colonies who joined the different groups. The conservative community of Alexanderwohl from the Molotschna, which two generations earlier had come as a body from Prussia to South Russia and which from the very beginning played a leading role in the movement, left its home in the summer of 1874 in a body as it had come. The communities of Bergthal, Fürstenland, and the whole group of the Hutterites, did the same thing.

In spite of the well-to-do situation of the Mennonites in Russia, there was, for reasons mentioned above, a considerable number of poor among the immigrants. The poorest among them were those from Volhynia who were in large part dependent on the material support of their American brethren.

Aware of this fact, the American Mennonites from the very beginning set out to help their coreligionists. In the American Mennonite papers this matter occupied much space. When the movement started in Russia it was known that the immigrants would need financial help as well as support in their transportation and settlement. As early as the fall of 1873 the editor of the *Friedensbote* came out with a comprehensive plan for organized help.

---

[86] According to the data found in the Mennonite periodicals *Zur Heimath, Friedensbote,* and *Herald of Truth,* diligently gathered by Jacob Sudermann (Manuscript in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen, Indiana.)

His proposals for an immediate collection of funds to aid the cause were taken as a basis for consultations at the conferences held. Unanimous consent was given throughout the Mennonite communities to this plan for help.

The Western District Conference of Mennonites had appointed a committee for this purpose. The (old) Mennonites of the Middle West did likewise. These two committees joined to form the Mennonite Board of Guardians, which in turn elected a board of directors.[87] In the East, the Mennonites of Pennsylvania appointed another Committee called the Mennonite Executive Aid Committee. The Canadian brethren likewise had their own organization.

These freely organized relief committees were to play an important role in the transportation and settlement of their immigrant brethren. They sent the necessary information and instructions to Russia in order to prevent them from falling into the hands of irresponsible agents. They had their representatives at the ports of Hamburg and New York who helped the immigrants and protected the incomers from fraud and other evils to which immigrants usually have been subject, and took care of them in every possible way.

One of the principal tasks of these organizations was the making of contracts with steamship and railway companies in order to get the lowest possible rates. The Canadian Committee had made an agreement with the Allan Line which ran between Hamburg and Quebec by way of Liverpool. The Mennonite Board of Guardians made a contract with the Hamburg-American Line which was operating between Hamburg and New York, and a joint contract with the Inman Line and the Erie Railroad company. The provisions of this last agreement were very favorable to the immigrants. The original contract may therefore well be cited here:[88]

Confidential. February 27, 1874.

(1) The Inman Line agree to provide for the transportation of said emigrants from Hamburg to New York, via Hull and Liverpool.

(2) The Erie Railway Company agree to transport said emigrants from New York to the following named places in the United States, Atchison, Kansas; Omaha, Nebraska; Sioux City, Iowa; and St. Paul, Minnesota.

---

87 This board in its first meeting mapped out its plan of action (*Herald of Truth*, February, 1874).

88 The document is in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen, Indiana.

(3) The joint through fare of the Inman Line and Erie Railway for said emigrants shall be as follows:

From	Hamburg	to	Atchison	$42.00
"	"	"	Omaha	41.00
"	"	"	Sioux City	42.00
"	"	"	St. Paul	41.00

Children between 5 and 12 years half fare, children between 1 and 5 years half fare from Hamburg to New York, and free from New York to Atchison, Omaha, Sioux City and St. Paul. Infants under one year free for entire distance. 20 cubic feet of baggage free to each adult from Hamburg to New York and 150 pounds of baggage free on the Erie Railway.

(4) The Inman Line agree to forward said people from Hamburg to New York without delay and while on the passage shall provide good and wholesome food which shall be served three times daily. Milk to be furnished as required for women and children; and hot water to be furnished to all passengers wherever required to make tea or coffee. Sufficient room shall be reserved aboard ship for all passengers so as to avoid any discomfort by crowding. There shall be one or more German stewards aboard each vessel who can communicate with passengers in their own language.

(5) The Mennonite Board of Guardians will appoint one person as their agent in Hamburg whose business it shall be to receive the Mennonites on their arrival in Hamburg and impart to them all necessary information about the journey and to furnish them with the necessary orders for passengers agreed upon with the Inman Line and the Erie Railway. The Inman Line agrees to pay said agent the sum of fifty dollars gold per month for his services.

(6) The Inman Line will make reduction of one third from the regular fare for any Mennonites who may wish to take cabin or intermediate passage.

(7) The Erie Railway Company agree that said emigrants on their arrival at New York shall be promptly forwarded to their destination on emigrant express trains and that there shall be no unnecessary changes of cars on the road. A sufficient number of cars shall be attached to each train so that every passenger shall be comfortably seated. The cars shall be roomy, well lighted and ventilated, supplied with ice water, stoves in winter, cushioned seats, and water closets. The trains shall be stopped at suitable places for meals, and ample time will be allowed for this purpose. The meals and provisions shall be furnished at reasonable rates. Whenever there is a large party of emigrants going west together, a leader will be furnished by the M. B. G. who shall accompany the party to their destination. The Erie Railway Company will also arrange so that all who wish to do so may stop over at places on the route to see their friends, and resume their journey at pleasure.

(8) In consideration of the above liberal arrangement the M. B. G. cordially agree to use their entire influence to have all of said Mennonites choose the said Inman Line and Erie Railway on their route from Europe to their new homes in the United States and said

board further agree that whenever their people are ready from time to time to start from Hamburg, said Board shall deposit with the Inman Line in New York the amount necessary to pay their through fares, and the Inman Line shall thereupon issue to said board (or their correspondent in Hamburg) a corresponding number of through certificates.

The M. B. G. have every reason to believe that about two thousand families of Mennonites will come from Europe during the year of this contract.

The agreement shall be binding for one year and is renewable for two or three years.

Signed: G. Nicholson (Inman Lines)
Abbot (Erie Railroad Company)
Jacob Schantz, B. Warkentin (M. B. G.)

A special agreement was made between the M. B. G. and the Erie Railway to the effect that the M. B. G. would use all its influence to forward their people to the West via the Erie Railway, and to coöperate with it to the best of their ability.

The Mennonites of Pennsylvania, however, did not agree with the preference given by the M. B. G. to the Inman Line. They made a contract with the Red Star Line operating between Antwerp and Philadelphia. The reason for their doing so was stated, as being due to the fact that the Pennsylvania Mennonites had a predilection for the Red Star Line, which belonged to the Quakers.[89] The Quakers had always been friendly to the Mennonites and had a deep interest in their well-being. Therefore the Pennsylvania Mennonites preferred to give their money to the Quakers rather than to send it to New York. As the Pennsylvania brethren were better off they would be willing to collect more money for the poor and would do so more willingly if they knew that it would go to the Red Star Line. They also would then create a reception home where the poor and sick could rest after their arrival. As the Red Star Line rates were cheaper than those of the Inman Line by at least five to six dollars a person, the Pennsylvania Mennonites thought this should be reason enough to take it since there were so many poor among the immigrants.[90]

---

89 This was written by J. F. Funk in a long letter to a Mennonite leader in Russia trying to convince them to come over on the Red Star Line. (Manuscript in the Mennonite Historical Library, Goshen, Indiana.)

90 In addition, the Red Star Line was willing for the colonists to choose an agent to be stationed at Antwerp and be paid by the company. Furthermore, whenever there would be a group of emigrants of over one hundred persons, they could have their own supervisor. He should see that the emigrants be given good care and all comfort.

During the year 1874 there arrived in American ports 1275 families on the following steamship lines.[91]

Inman Line	300	families
Allan Line	230	"
Red Star Line	300	"
Hamburg-American Line	442	"
Adler Line	3	"

Upon their arrival in the port the immigrants made the decision where they were going to settle. As a rule they were accompanied to their destination by a railroad agent or by a representative of the American Mennonite relief committees.

It was the function of these organizations from the very beginning to provide the necessary funds not only for enabling the poor to come over, but also to settle and start farming. It has been an outstanding feature in the Mennonite history that whenever help is needed by one group or another, no matter in what part of the world it may be, they always lend a helping hand to their brethren, thus proving in reality their practical Christianity.

The appeal for financial help made shortly after the different organizations were effected, found a lively echo in the hearts of the American Mennonites. As one goes through the many letters from all parts of the United States, fortunately preserved in the Mennonite Historical Library at Goshen, Indiana, one can not but admire the interest in the movement and the willingness to help. Detailed accounts of the money received from different church communities as well as private donors for the Russian Immigration Fund give a vital impression of the zeal with which the help was given. Figures best tell the story.[92]

By September of 1874 there was deposited in the banks of New York for the Mennonite Immigration Fund a total of 17,000 dollars by the Mennonite Board of Guardians, 15,000 dollars by the Pennsylvania Aid Committee and 10,000 dollars by the Canadian organization. During the entire time of the relief activities these three organizations contributed to this work approximately 40,000 dollars each, thus making the total amount of money expended by them 120,000 dollars.

This does not include the material assistance by individuals to the poor immigrant brethren. Such assistance took the form

---

[91] According to the report of the Mennonite Board of Guardians, of February, 1875, Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[92] The money was given either for payment of transportation fees, or as a gift for direct aid, or for loans extended at moderate rates for a period of several years.

sometimes of money, sometimes of clothing or individual loans, of which there are no records available. Furthermore when an appeal was made by the organizations, whole immigrant families were cared for by Mennonite farmers for weeks or months. This was especially the case among the eastern Mennonites.

It can safely be said that the material assistance given by the American Mennonites to their immigrant brethren amounted to at least 150,000 dollars.

The Mennonite immigrants practically all settled in the frontier states of Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota and Minnesota and the Canadian province of Manitoba. The arrivals of the year 1874 went to the following states:[93]

Dakota	200	families
Manitoba	230	"
Minnesota	15	"
Nebraska	80	"
Kansas	600	"
In the East remained	150	"

When the other states saw that Kansas was far ahead, having received more than all the other states in the Union put together, they renewed their activities with greater zeal in praising their land. In the following years Kansas did not receive the high proportion she had the first year. But still at the end of this emigration period, the Kansas settlement resulting from this immigration was the largest in the United States. About half of the number of the United States settlers chose Kansas as their future home, the other half being located in Dakota, Nebraska and Minnesota. The Hutterites all settled in Dakota, in communities called Bruderhofs. The emigrants from the Molotschna colonies, those from the Volga, and the Volhynians settled in the United States, whereas those from Chortitza and her three daughter colonies Bergtal, Fuerstenland and Barsenko, went to Manitoba.

The entire number of Mennonites who immigrated during the decade of 1873-1883 from Russia to North America was about 18,000, of whom 10,000 settled within the United States, and 8,000 in Manitoba.

The settlement in Manitoba is one of particular interest because of the loan extended by the Canadian government to the Mennonite immigrants for their establishment. Prime Minister Mackenzie communicated to the House of Commons on February

---

93 Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 107.

Seminary

15, 1875, that a deputation of the Mennonites from Ontario solicited from the government an advance of 100,000 dollars to enable their brethren from Russia to settle in Canada. They had declared that they would be personally responsible for the repayment of the advanced amount in ten annual instalments. The government had considered the project favorably and the Prime Minister introduced a bill asking for a grant of the loan, thus adding to the population of the country a large number of the best immigrants. "He had no doubt the investment would be a good one and that every cent of the money would be repaid to the government."[94]

In explaining the proposed bill before the House of Commons, the Minister of Finance Cartwright, on February 19, said that "the Mennonites resident in Waterloo county are for the most part a wealthy class and bear the highest reputation for strict honesty and integrity in meeting their pecuniary engagements," and he believed that the money would be repaid to the last farthing. Mennonites of far less means in the Northwest had repaid most creditably money advanced to them, and payment of debts was a doctrine in the Mennonite faith.[95]

As the bill was the first of its kind, it led to long debates in the course of which much was said about the Mennonites and their value as colonists.

Masson, the representative of the French constituency Terrebonne, objected to the bill though he knew the Mennonites "to be an orderly and quiet people." This objection was based on the ground of the policy pursued. He proposed an amendment in favor of spending half the sum on the return of the French Canadians residing in the United States. To his question as to what steps had been taken in regard to those French Canadians who from the United States had applied to the government to assist them in obtaining two townships in Manitoba for their settlement, the Prime Minister replied that the two cases he knew of were failures. In the one case in which French immigrants had settled on the East side of the Red River under certain condition, these colonists had not met the conditions. The second case was similar.[96] Representative Trow, referring to the failures of these two French colonies, stated that "the Mennonite colony was, however, a stern reality."

---

[94] Canada. *Debates of the House of Commons, Session* 1875, February 15. Vol. I, p. 141.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 249.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 249 f.

The former Minister of Agriculture, Pope, "fully concurred in the proposed loan of 100,000 dollars to the Mennonites because he was perfectly satisfied that the money would be returned and that the immigrants were of as good a class as could be obtained."

Representative Dymond thought the simple fact that Mennonites became responsible for the repayment of the loan "should be sufficient to satisfy everyone. Their simple promise was as binding upon them as would be their mortgage or an oath."[97]

Smith of Manitoba "cordially sympathized with the proposal to encourage the immigration of Mennonites to Manitoba and he would be very sorry to see the amount reduced. He proceeded to speak in high terms of the Mennonites as a very valuable class of immigrants." Had the government asked for 150,000 dollars, he would vote for it, "for it would be money well spent even though not a dollar of it was directly repaid. The same amount of money could not be spent more profitably in any other way."[98]

Referring to other settlements, Laird made the statement that of all attempts which had been made at colonization, the Mennonite colony was the only one that had been successful. For, as Trow pointed out, the Mennonites if once settled would be likely to remain, and they were first class settlers. He was certain that the principal and interest of the loan would be repaid for their word was as good as their bond. The reason for their success was to be found in the fact, as Dymond emphasized, that they were bound together by religious and social ties, and stood shoulder to shoulder in every difficulty. For the repayment of the loan therefore the whole community was pledged.

The peaceful progress of the debates was suddenly interrupted when a Scotchman, Campbell from Victoria, came up and said that instead of settling Manitoba with Mennonites, who were against bearing of arms, it would be better to send to the hills of Scotland and Ireland and bring out a hardy people who would help to fight the battles of the country.[99]

The bill was finally passed with a few amendments and thus very large support was furnished for the establishment of the Mennonites. It is interesting to state that the expectations of the government were fully realized: the loan was completely repaid in due

---

97 *Ibid.*, p. 251.

98 *Ibid.* February 20, p. 379 f. Young thought the fact that the Mennonites in Waterloo and elsewhere had become responsible for the loan would be guarantee enough as they were some of the wealthiest people of the country.

99 *Ibid.*, p. 387.

time. This was, in the words of the Minister of the Interior, "unparalleled in the history of Canada."

The German Mennonite Immigrants from Russia settled on farms in the United States and Canada, tilling the soil with the methods which they brought with them. They soon became leaders in the milling industry in the prairie states.

Among the many interesting features of the Mennonite economic development which might be discussed, most noteworthy is that of their introduction of the Turkey wheat into America. Thoughtful as they were of what might grow in the new country, these German colonists took with them various seeds, among others also hard winter wheat, the so-called Turkey wheat, a fact which was to become of high significance not only for their own farming, but for the whole wheat production in the United States.

Reference need only be made to the statement of the United States government authorities[100] in order to see the relation between the development of the Turkey wheat[101] in the United States, and the German immigration from Russia.

"The history of hard winter wheat in the United States is closely associated with the movement of the Russian Mennonite immigrants to the middle Great Plains. These people originally went from West Prussia to Southern Russia about 1770 because of certain land grants and civil privileges offered by the government under Empress Catherine. Over one hundred years later their descendants, desiring further advantages to be obtained in America, emigrated to the middle Great Plains and settled principally in Kansas. The greater number were from the Molotschna colonies in Northern Taurida, but some were from the Crimea proper and others from Ekaterinoslaw. The first settlements in Kansas were made in 1873, near Newton, Halstead and Moundridge. Each family brought over a bushel or more of Crimean wheat for seed, and from this seed was grown the first crop of Kansas hard winter wheat. Bernard Warkentin, a miller, who created mills at Newton and Halstead, was chiefly instrumental

100 Carleton, M. A.: "Hard wheats winning their way" in *United States Department of Agriculture,* 1914, p. 398 ff. The statements on the history of the hard winter wheat are reprinted in *United States Department of Agriculture, Bulletin* No. 1074. Washington, 1922, *Classification of American Wheat Varieties.*

101 Turkey is the most commonly used name for the Crimean group of hard winter wheats grown in the United States. Its original home, the Black Sea region in South Russia, is strikingly similar in conditions of soil and climate to the Great Plains. "A traveller on the Plains of Kansas, if suddenly transported while asleep to Southern Russia, and deposited in the Crimea, would discover very little difference in his surroundings except as to the people and the character of farm improvements and live stock. Even the last would be of the same kind, if he were transported from certain localities in Kansas where Russian immigrants now live. It is therefore natural that the center of hard wheat production in this country should be in Kansas since in Russia it is in the Crimea. The climate of the Russian district is a little more severe, which fact makes Crimean wheat all the more satisfactory for Kansas." (Carleton, *l. c.,* p. 398.)

in introducing the Turkey wheat, but in this pioneer movement of the Mennonites two other men were associated, Christian Krehbiel, first a farmer, but who later in 1886 erected a mill at Moundridge, and C. B. Schmidt, acting as immigration agent for the Santa Fe Railroad.

"There is an interesting feature of this introduction of a great crop in the fact that the crop and the people who knew best how to grow it, migrated together. The Mennonites had been growing the wheat in its original home many years although in the Molotschna District, spring wheat was grown up to 1860, when Turkey wheat was introduced there from the Crimea, and entirely replaced the spring wheat. On account of the small rainfall in Taurida, an important feature of cultivation there is the 'Cherny par,' or black fallow, called black simply from the very dark color of the rich turned over soil. It is really a summer tillage and there are four cultivations. First a deep plowing and then three lighter operations at intervals of a month afterwards, made by very small gang plows or cultivators. Therefore, these people on coming to the Great Plains were already acquainted with the practices of early deep plowing and thorough surface cultivation, which not until a quarter of a century later were widely advocated in this country in connection with dry farming.

"The good qualities of the Turkey wheat were not generally appreciated much before the close of the last century, twenty-five years after its introduction by the Mennonites. At the Kansas experiment station its superiority came to light about 1897, though it had been under experiment for some time. . . . As early as 1901 hard winter wheat at New York was quoted at a fairly good price. All recent prices (1914) at the important markets show a decided but gradual change in attitude toward hard winter wheat, so that it is now ranked, where it should be, among the first class wheats. It has 'won its way' through difficulties in accordance with the motto of the state where its production is greatest . . . and is now more generally in favor in this country than any other winter wheat. In California, where it is not adopted, a third to a half of all wheat annually used by the mills is imported from the middle Great Plains. It has encroached upon the hard spring wheat area to the northward in Iowa and Nebraska and upon the area of softer wheats to the westward in the Rocky Mountain States, and has made Montana a wheat state . . . making in all 350,000,000 bushels as the approximate average annual hard wheat production in this country. This is about a half of the average total wheat production in this country."

It has been pointed out that besides the Mennonites there immigrated to North America German colonists from Russia of other denominations in larger numbers. Unlike the Mennonites they did not come in organized groups. Neither did they find any organized assistance on their arrival in the New World. Whereas the Mennonite immigration practically stopped with the period described above, the influx of these other groups into the United States and Canada continued up to the outbreak of the World War in 1914.

According to the Fifteenth United States Census of 1930 there were in the United States at that time 103,371 foreign-born whites from Russia of German mother tongue.[102] In 1920 the corresponding number had been 116,536. The first and second generations of the German colonists from Russia, i. e. foreign-born white and total foreign white stock of German mother tongue from Russia was 303,532 in 1928. Among these the different groups are represented approximately in the following numbers:[103]

Mennonites	31,000
Evangelical Germans from the Ukraine (Black Sea region)	79,000
Catholic Germans from the Ukraine	37,000
Evangelical Germans from the Volga District	100,000
Catholic Germans from the Volga District	19,000
Germans from Volhynia and Lithyania	37,000

It is superfluous to state that the German colonists from Russia, Mennonites as well as the other denominations, became good farmers in the New World and contributed a great deal to the development of the regions wherever they settled.

A study of the German Mennonite immigration from Russia to America would be incomplete without mentioning the movement since the creation of the Soviet rule. This topic which should be given special treatment, can be but briefly considered here. This seems necessary, however, in order to carry the story of the whole movement from its beginning up to the present time.[104]

The experiences during the great war, including the persecutions by the Czarist Government of Russian citizens of German descent, the Russianization policy, then the suffering during the Russian Civil War and the *Machnowregime,* at last the rigid realization of the communistic principle under the Soviet system, abolition of private property and above all the fight against church and

---

102 *Fifteenth United States Census,* 1930. Mother Tongue of the foreign born white population, by Leon E. Truesdell, Table 6, p. 11.

103 Richard Sallet: *Russlanddeutsche Siedlungen in den Vereinigten Staaten,* reprint from the *German American Historical Review,* Chicago, 1931, p. 108. As editor of the Russian-German newspaper *Dakota Freie Presse,* the author is very well acquainted with his subject. With his large knowledge gathered through many years in personal contact with the Germans from Russia he presents a thoroughly reliable scientific treatment of the subject, the best study there is on the Germans from Russia in the United States.

104 The following discussion is based primarily upon the report of the *Mennonitische Welt-Hilfs-Conferenz vom* 31. *August bis* 3. *September* 1930 in Danzig, edited by Christian Neff, Karlsruhe, 1930.

religion—all these caused the Mennonites in 1920 to send a delegation to America in order to find out the possibilities for settlement. This delegation consisted of the leaders, B. H. Unruh, A. A. Friesen, C. H. Warkentin and Johann Esau. After having investigated the United States, Mexico and Canada the delegates found that Canada was best suited for their purpose.[105] There was, however, one obstacle. By an order of Cabinet of 1918, further immigration of Mennonites to Canada had been prohibited. Therefore a delegation was sent by the Canadian Mennonites to the Dominion Government, whereupon the Prime Minister, Mackenzie King, a friend of the Mennonites, and the Ministers of Agriculture and Immigration, gave their promise that the order in Council would be repealed.[106] In April of 1922 the "Canadian Mennonite Board of Colonization" was founded, which was to direct the immigration and settlement of their brethren from Russia. Difficulties, however, between the Canadian and Soviet governments brought almost unsurmountable obstacles. Had it not been for help from Germany, many could not have migrated. The German Government permitted the Mennonite emigrants on their way from Russia to America who could not pass the Canadian Medical examination to stay for a while in Lager Lechfeld in Bavaria. After removing the obstacles, the emigration started in the summer of 1923 and continued until 1928. The following were the numbers of Mennonite immigrants to Canada each year:

1923	2,759
1924	5,048
1925	3,772
1926	5,940
1927	847
1928	511
Total	18,877

With the help of the Canadian and the United States Mennonites and with the assistance of the Canadian Mennonite Board of Colonization, two thousand families were settled on farms worth approximately $25,000,000.

---

105 Report of Bishop Toews, Canada: "Die Auswanderung Aus Russland bis Herbst 1928," *ibid.*, pp. 73-79, and "Die Einwanderung nach Canada von Herbst 1928 bis jetzt," *ibid.*, pp. 94-99.

106 This delegation was sent by the Conference held at Herbert, Sask., in the summer of 1921. In Montreal the delegates were promised by the Director of the Immigration Department of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, Col. Dennis, a credit for transportation of 3,000 immigrants.

In 1927, however, the Canadian Government issued a decree requiring that every immigrant should have a passport, which meant that the Mennonite refugees who were in Manchuria could not enter Canada. The German government was willing to provide them with "Personalausweise," the Canadian Mennonite Board of Colonization guaranteeing the expenses in case of a deportation. But the Dominion Government found other reasons for prohibiting their entry and at last 214 of the refugees were allowed to enter the United States. This movement took place in 1931.

In 1929 the Soviet Government resolved to fight the "decisive battle" against the "Kulaks" i. e. the formerly prosperous peasants, against religion and family, against that spirit which was the fundamental basis of the conception of life of the German colonists.[107] Then in the autumn of 1929 about fifteen thousand colonists from all over the country rushed to Moscow to compel the Soviet Government to permit them to leave the country, as emigration for Soviet citizens had been made practically impossible. It was on the ground of their German nationality that they applied for help to the German government through the German Ambassador in Moscow whose office they besieged. The German people took up the Mennonite matter as their own. The German Reichstag in a special session without delay unanimously assigned a credit of the six million marks, in addition to the sums given by private organizations. It made representations to the Soviet government to secure permission for the Mennonites to emigrate and made the necessary arrangements for their temporary stay in Germany.

Forced by the public opinion of the world which paid great attention to the elemental outcry of a part of the population under the Soviet System, the Moscow government had to yield and permitted the emigration of several thousands (3,700) of Mennonites. They were transported to Germany at the expense of the German Government, were kept there until their further settlement in Canada, Brazil and Paraguay. For this migration the German Government was also in part financially responsible, advancing the credit for transportation.

About one thousand reached Canada under the auspices of the Canadian Mennonite Board of Colonization. About twelve

[107] Benjamin H. Unruh in his excellent article "The background and causes of the flight of the Mennonites from Russia" in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, IV, No. 4 (October, 1930), pp. 267-281, V, No. 1 (January, 1931), pp. 28-41. Cf. also his report on "Die Massenflucht der deutschen Bauern aus der Soviet-Union, ihre Grunde ihre Auswirkungen in Russland und ihre Folgen für das Hilfswerk in Ausland" in *Bericht über die Mennonitische Welt-Hilfs-Konferenz*," pp. 79-88.

hundred of the refugees were settled in Brazil, in the state of Santa Catharina, on the land of the Hanseatic Colonization Company of Hamburg, near Hammonia, where about 100,000 Germans were already living. Assistance was given to this settlement by the Mennonites of Holland.[108]

The other group, about 1500, was settled in the Chaco in Paraguay under the auspices of and with the assistance of the Mennonites of the United States. The Mennonite Central Committee for Relief, after careful investigation found that the Chaco with its rich soil and in view of the privileges granted, was best suited for the settlement. After negotiations with the German Government led by Professor Harold S. Bender on behalf of the Mennonite Central Committee, the Mennonites of the United States took over a heavy responsibility and charge in providing means for their establishment. The cost of the necessary equipment and other assistance in the first year provided by the Mennonite Central Committee amounted to about $500.00 per family. The cost of the settlement of one family, consisting of transportation, equipment and land, was about $1500.[109] Altogether the Mennonite Central Committee spent in cash about $125,000 for the settlement in the Chaco. The work of Professor Benjamin H. Unruh was of prime importance in making the Chaco settlement possible, particularly in his negotiations with the German government and the German relief organization known as "Bruder in Not" for financial assistance.

Without the generous help of the German government, the German people and the Mennonites of America, this safe departure from Russia and foreign settlement of the Mennonites would not have been accomplished. It was the national and religious ties which in times of distress proved strong and saved these thousands of German colonists in their flight from Russia.

---

108 Report of Pastor Gorter: "Die Einwanderung nach Brasilien," in *Bericht über die Mennonitische Welt-Hilfs-Konferenz,"* pp. 90-93.

109 H. S. Bender: "Die Einwanderung nach Paraguay," *ibid.,* pp. 117-125. This report shows with what care the task of settling thousands of refugees in the Chaco was undertaken by the Mennonite Central Committee.

WAS WILLIAM RITTENHOUSE THE FIRST MENNONITE BISHOP IN AMERICA?

HAROLD S. BENDER

One of the most familiar "facts" of early American Mennonite History is the supposition that William Rittenhouse of Germantown was the first Mennonite bishop in America. Indeed, unqualified assertions to this effect are to be found in the commonly used books on Mennonite history written by our leading historians. Some time ago the writer had occasion to study the early history of the Mennonite church in Germantown and being unable to find any positive proof of Rittenhouse's service as bishop, became somewhat skeptical about it. A thorough study of all the available original documents which might shed light on the question not only deepened the doubt, but seemed to prove positively that Rittenhouse was never more than a preacher. The following brief summary of the evidence gathered on the point is given as a contribution toward the solution of the problem. Possibly someone has evidence to the contrary which will be brought to light as a response to the discussion.

So far as the writer has been able to determine, the first suggestion that Rittenhouse may have been ordained as the first bishop in America was made by Mrs. Anna Brons in her book, *Ursprung, Entwickelung und Schicksale der Taufgesinnten oder Mennoniten,* which was published at Norden, Germany in 1884. Mrs. Brons had found in the archive of the Mennonite church at Altona, Germany, an interesting and valuable extract from a letter of March, 1702, addressed by the ministers of the church at Altona to certain members of the young church at Germantown, in which the suggestion of the American Mennonites is rejected that someone be sent from Altona to perform the rites of baptism and communion and possibly to ordain a bishop for further performance of these rites. The Altona ministers suggest in their letter that the church in America should proceed with these rites without the ordination of a bishop, thus following the scriptural example of Philip and Paul, both of whom baptized without having been ordained as bishops, Philip having been only a deacon. Mrs. Brons interpreted the letter to suggest that a bishop should be ordained by the congregation without requiring another bishop to perform the cere-

mony. There is a bare possibility that the interpretation of Mrs. Brons is correct, since the letter is somewhat obscure, but certainly the weight of the evidence falls against it. On the basis of her interpretation however, Mrs. Brons concluded that "as a result of this letter, they probably chose a bishop, and William Rittenhouse must have been chosen, since he was listed as one of the oldest preachers in the Mennonite colony in Germantown; he died in 1708."[1] It is clear from this quotation that Mrs. Brons had no concrete evidence that the congregation actually chose a bishop or that Rittenhouse was the candidate even if they did ordain one. She is indeed cautious enough to state that the church "probably" followed the advice of the letter and ordained a bishop, and that Rittenhouse "must" have been the one. However, it would have been better for our history if Mrs. Brons had not done any speculating at all on this point, for later historians seem to have taken over her statement, omitted the "probably" and the "must", and set it down as a "fact" that as a result of the letter a bishop was ordained and Rittenhouse was the man.

So far as the writer can determine, Daniel K. Cassel was the first writer to do this. His book, *History of the Mennonites,* published at Philadelphia in 1888, is "dedicated to the memory of William Rittenhouse, first Mennonite Bishop in America". Thus we see history in the making, and William Rittenhouse, by the fiat of a careless author, becomes before our eyes the first bishop in America. In the body of the book, in discussing this point, Cassel gives Mrs. Brons as his authority, referring to her citation of the above-mentioned Altona letter of 1702.[2] He says, "In consequence of the above instructions, William Rittenhouse was installed as bishop of the first Mennonite Church in America, at Germantown, about 1701." In the next sentence he refers to a letter written from Germantown to Amsterdam, dated September 3, 1708, indirectly stating that it is the source "from which these particulars are derived". This suggests that the 1708 letter is the source of the definite knowledge that Rittenhouse was ordained as the first bishop.

Let us therefore examine the letter of 1708. This letter, written in Dutch, now reposes in the archive of the Mennonite Church of Amsterdam, Holland. A certified hand-written copy of

---

1 Anna Brons, *Ursprung . . . der Taufgesinnten,* Norden, 1884, p. 225. The letter itself is published in German translation in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* for October, 1931.

2 Daniel K. Cassel, *History of the Mennonites,* Philadelphia, 1888, pp. 104, 105.

this letter is in the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania at 1300 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. A photostatic reproduction of this copy was secured by the Mennonite Historical Society of Goshen College. From this photostat an English translation has been made by the writer, and is herewith presented with permission of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. So far as is known, no copy of this letter in the original or in translation has ever been published. The letter follows.

Germantown, Sept. 3, 1708

Very worthy, and from the heart beloved friends, Hermanus Schyn and co-ministers of the Mennonite Churches in Holland, and to whom this letter may come, who stand with us united in faith as workers in the spiritual vineyard of the Almighty God and our Lord Jesus Christ, grace and peace be with you from the mercy of God with the help of the Holy Ghost; and to all those who fear the Lord may much good and comfort and the eternal inheritance of eternal life be wished.

Your very welcome writing of April 16, 1707, signed by the ministers of Hamburg and Altona and by you and with your full approval, has come to hand. We have well understood your good instruction, and the letter gave us sufficient answer and was with joy received by our aged preacher, Willem Rittinghuyssen. He was accordingly fully resolved to serve with baptism upon their desire those who were requesting it and had requested it. However the Lord laid him and his wife on a sickbed and in a few days he was taken from us, which was a painful loss to us. And about two or three days before his departure he gave a brief admonition, and taking his leave of the brethren fell asleep in the Lord, he being between 64 and 66 years old. His going was a grievous experience to us. Let me say, as it stands in the Revelation of John 14:13, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord"; and as a certain poet says, "Sleep then my friend in God who lives until that joyous day—till when thy God who can do all things again will give life."

We had then not more than one who served us by reading a sermon, which so much more caused sorrow among us; and having called upon the Lord about it, we found it advisable to wait in hope that the Lord might again raise up one for us. We therefore chose two as preachers, and two as deacons, of whom one has already given for us two sermons to the satisfaction of the brotherhood. I hope that the Lord will grant His grace and blessing further. So we went ahead with the administration of baptism to those who

desired it. There were eleven men and women added to the church by baptism. We entreat then earnestly and kindly, since we hear from the brethren who recently have come here that there is a preacher who is inclined to come over, that you will keep us in mind and be helpful to them (him) on their (his) way, unto the propagation of the church here which should have a great increase in time. We shall thankfully recognize your love and kindness since we learn from the brethren that he was embued with such zeal and earnestness. By the request of the ministers of Hamburg, Peter Kolb[3] was named to choose a bishop. We also intend to correspond with the ministers of Hamburg.

Now our loving and friendly request to the ministers would be for some catechisms for the children and little Testaments for the youth. The members here are poorly supplied with psalm-books. And we have here no Bible in the meeting house. Some have a small Bible. So that each has not more than one Bible and cannot well spare it. We dare not prescribe the number for you but leave it to your inclination and love. The congregation here is still rather weak to have anything printed. It would cost a great sum to have printing done here, and both here and in New York printing is in English. Hence we, or rather our aged friend and preacher, Willem Rittinghuyssen, wrote to New York to have the articles of faith printed in English because there are people here who call themselves Mennists who would like to have our articles translated into English. But they asked so much that our congregation could not raise it. When the people from Germany come here they have spent everything on the journey and then have to start new. This is hard at first. Some buy a piece of land and have to build a house on it. What they need more than this for their necessities they all have to work to pay. As ministers, we wish that what comes from [the sale of] the books that are left over be given to the poor; we ought to be grateful for the sake of the poor.

But the time and opportunity is getting short, and a friend is waiting to depart. We request then heartily that the brethren remember us in sincere prayer that the Lord be with us in these foreign regions, and that He may strengthen us with His spirit to the upbuilding of the church and to the salvation of our souls.

Herewith we close and, with hearty greetings from us, com-

---

3 Peter Kolb, brother of Martin Kolb, was Mennonite minister at Mannheim, Germany, where he died in 1727.

mit all the ministers and brethren to the keeping and protection of Almighty God. Your friends and brethren in Christ,

Jacob Goetshalck
Harmen Karsdorp
Martin Kolb

We request from you some time a letter which would be very agreeable and welcome to us.

Isaac van Sintern
Conradt Jansen

A careful study of the above document reveals the fact that a letter had been written from Germantown to Europe, apparently requesting counsel from the Mennonite ministers in Amsterdam and Altona, as to what to do with certain candidates for baptism. The writer, apparently Jacob Godshalk, states clearly that Rittenhouse had decided as a result of the advice given in the reply, to proceed with baptism. Is it likely that he would have felt the need of this advice if he had been a regularly ordained bishop? Furthermore, although Godshalk once uses the term, "elder", or bishop, ("oudste" in Dutch) he consistently refers to Rittenhouse merely as preacher, ("leerar" in Dutch). There is certainly no positive evidence of any sort in the letter which would justify Cassel in saying that he derived from it the "particulars" regarding the ordination of Rittenhouse as bishop. In fact, it is to be seriously questioned that Cassel ever saw the letter. No doubt, at this point, he followed his usual custom of using material from other writers without quoting or giving the source of his information.

The one reference to a "bishop" in the letter is difficult to understand. This is the sentence referring to the choice by the ministers at Hamburg-Altona of Peter Kolb to select a bishop. The original Dutch of this sentence is altogether ambiguous. It is given here for evidence, — "Door het versoeck van de dienaaren van Hamburg Pieter Kolb genoemt seynde tot een ousten verkooren." It is not clear whether Peter Kolb was appointed to select a bishop, or whether he had been chosen to be a bishop himself. In either case the meaning of the passage is obscure. Does it mean that Peter Kolb, who was a Mennonite minister living in Mannheim, Germany was appointed to go to America as bishop, or does it mean that Peter Kolb was appointed to conduct in Germany a choice by lot for bishop from among the names of the several candidates to be sent to him by mail. There is no trace whatsoever in the records of the early Mennonite Church at Germantown or in

eastern Pennsylvania of an immigrant bishop by the name of Peter Kolb.

The final evidence to be examined in connection with the problem under consideration is the letter written by Andreas Ziegler and others of Skippack, Pennsylvania under date of March 1, 1773 to several Dutch Mennonite ministers.[4] This letter contains what purports to be a history of the church at Germantown from its beginning to 1712, written by Jacob Godshalk. This is the sole extant source of information concerning the early ecclesiastical history of the Germantown congregation, except for the two earlier documents already discussed. Godshalk tells about the election of Rittenhouse as the first preacher, with Jan Neuss as the first deacon, and the second election of preachers on October 8, 1702 when Jacob Godshalk and Hans Neuss were chosen. The latter, he says, soon withdrew from the congregation as the result of a quarrel with another member, Arnold van Vossen. We learn of the death of Rittenhouse on February 18, 1708, and the choice of two additional preachers on April 20, 1708, Harmen Karsdorp and Martin Kolb. We also learn of the ordination of three new deacons on March 22, 1708, namely: Isaac van Sintern, Heinrich Cassel, and Conrad Jansen. But no mention is made of any election or ordination of a bishop. In fact Godshalk explicitly states that he himself, by order of the congregation, performed the first baptism by which members were received into the Mennonite Church in America. This rite was performed on or before May 23, 1708, when eleven candidates were baptized.

It is even a question whether Jacob Godshalk himself was ordained as bishop. He seems to have functioned as the leader of the congregation at Skippack for many years until he died at a ripe old age in 1763, and very likely was a bishop, but there is no unequivocal evidence regarding his ordination to that office. It is possible that he was ordained by some bishop among the later immigrants who had already been ordained in Europe.

But whether Jacob Godshalk became the first bishop in America or not, it seems quite clear on the basis of the available evidence that William Rittenhouse was never ordained a bishop, but remained merely a preacher until his death. The writer will welcome any further evidence on this question.

---

[4] The letter was published in English translation in the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* for October, 1929, q. v.

IS DR. KUEHLER'S CONCEPTION OF EARLY DUTCH ANABAPTISM HISTORICALLY SOUND?

An Inquiry into Certain Theses Advanced by W. J. Kuehler in His "History of the Dutch Anabaptists in the 16th Century."*

John Horsch

I

INTRODUCTION

The long-awaited history of the early Dutch Anabaptists by Professor Dr. W. J. Kuehler, leading historian of the Dutch Mennonites, has at last appeared. Such a book has been long overdue, for there really has been no modern history of the Dutch Mennonites. Dr. Kuehler, who is head professor in the Mennonite Theological Seminary in Amsterdam, and also professor in the City University of Amsterdam, has now filled the gap with a stately volume of exhaustive character, devoted to the first century of Anabaptism in Holland. In many ways the book is a tribute to the sturdy scholarship and ripe learning of its author. The following chapter headings will give some conception of the contents of the book and the logical arrangement of its material: The Beginnings of Anabaptism; The Conditions under which Anabaptism Developed in the Netherlands; Melchior Hofman; Münster; Bockholt; Menno, David, Obbe; The Martyrs; The Waterlandians; Mystical Currents; Friesians and Flemish.

Without doubt, Dr. Kuehler's book is one of the most important volumes on Mennonite History which has been published in recent times. Among its many merits, not the least is the excellent treatment of the martyrs. What the author gives on this subject surpasses all that has been written on the life and sufferings of the early Dutch and Flemish martyrs of the Anabaptist brethren. However the book is marred by the attempt to establish certain theses concerning the nature of early Anabaptism and the character of its principles and leadership, on the basis of insufficient evidence. The writer is disposed to think that in this attempt Dr. Kuehler has been led away from strict historical accuracy and impartiality into an attempt to find in the early history of Dutch Anabaptism a justification for the present theological and ecclesiastical position which he and most of the leaders of Dutch Mennonitism hold to-day, a position which can best be characterized as one of advanced modern liberalism.

The book defends the thesis that in the first short period of their history the Netherlandian Mennonites were *vrijzinnig* (theologically liberal) rather than conservative, but soon showed inclinations toward conservatism. In various respects they, in the author's opinion, erred

* *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Doopsgezinden in de Zestiende Eeuw.* Door Dr. W. J. Kuehler. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink & Zoon, 1932. 472 pp.

from the true path under a selfishly ambitious leadership — erred in point of their supposed principal characteristic as deplorably as the New Jerusalem at Münster (346). The author says much in praise of the liberal leader Adam Pastor and of the Waterlandian Mennonites whom he also describes as *vrijzinnig,* and of the Mennonite martyrs who in his opinion represented the same *geestesrichting* (general religious position) as Adam Pastor (285). With these exceptions the book has little to say that is favorable but much that is the reverse concerning the Dutch Anabaptists of the sixteenth century. The book in fact brings serious charges against Menno Simons and the early Mennonites. In line with this general attitude the author says: "The present-day Doopsgezinden of the Netherlands could not possibly honor Menno Simons as the spiritual father of the religious position which they hold" (331). Obviously, if the author's estimate of early conservative Mennonitism is warranted, early Mennonite history would be properly classed with the liabilities rather than the assets of the Mennonite cause. Some of the questions raised and the conclusions arrived at by Dr. Kuehler could not be intelligently discussed in a mere review. An inquiry into the foundations of the various theses in question is in order. The general plan will be followed of selecting the major theses of the author which are to be subjected to examination, stating the author's position with page references to the book itself, and then following with a study of the evidence which makes the author's position untenable.

Did the so-called Anabaptist Sects Constitute Only One Movement?

Dr. Kuehler defends the thesis that all so-called Anabaptists of the Reformation period represented one and the same movement. Nevertheless he admits that the points of differentiation between some of the Anabaptist sects and parties were vital and fundamental. The Münsterite Anabaptists, he concedes, represented "a complete degeneration of Anabaptism" (84). "The original, essential Anabaptism," he says, "was at Münster officially given the letter of divorce" (114). He says further that within Anabaptism the most contradictory tenets were found (16,63), and that the contradictions, or contrasts, concerned the most important doctrines (114). He concedes that Anabaptism, if considered as *one* movement, presents a chaos (63). Obviously then our author's thesis of Anabaptism as *one* movement is defended by him only on the strange supposition that men who on the most vital points hold radically contradictory views may represent one and the same movement.

But we let our author speak for himself: "Anabaptism is everywhere the same and yet everywhere different" (15). "It rises in noble natures to the purest piety and to ideas which are far in advance of their time; it sinks away through conscienceless adher-

ents into unrighteousness" (6). "The movement gave room for opinions which radically contradicted each other" (16). Through Melchior Hofman's influence "Anabaptism became a chaos from which evil as well as good could come" (63). In regard to the New Jerusalem at Münster Professor Kuehler says: "An indelible stain in particular adhered to Anabaptism which had such a pure and promising beginning. For however frequently the painful truth had been denied, it cannot be gainsaid that Münster rose directly out of the Anabaptist movement and is an inseparable subdivision of the history of the movement" (189). According to our author, then, the crimes of the New Jerusalem in Münster are a stain on the good name of the evangelical Anabaptists, including the Mennonites.

It is, as a matter of course, a plain fact that a number of Anabaptist sects and groups were in doctrine, principle and practice so closely related to each other that they may be properly considered as presenting one movement. The Swiss Brethren, Mennonites, Hutterites, the congregations (in South Germany) in which Pilgram Marbeck was the most prominent minister, and many other Anabaptists in Austria and other provinces, constituted in reality only *one* movement. These may be designated as the evangelical Anabaptists. They disowned infant baptism, believing in the necessity of re-baptism on the confession of faith. It may be recalled that in all Catholic countries every inhabitant, excepting the Jews, had in his infancy been baptized or "christened" (according to Roman Catholic teaching, made a Christian). The Anabaptists did not recognize this baptism; they baptized those again who united with them, hence the name Anabaptists (re-baptizers, German *Wiedertäufer*). This was a nickname and was always repudiated by them.

However, there were a number of fanatical, revolutionary sects which under a religious cloak practiced and defended glaring immorality (to be described below). They were the Münsterites, the Batenburgers, the Davidians (followers of David Joris), the followers of Hendrik Niclaes and of Jan Wilhelm. With the evangelical Anabaptists they shared the view that infant baptism is unscriptural. They were therefore classed as Anabaptists although, with the exception of the Münsterites, they did not practice rebaptism. The Münsterites began this practice only after they had established their New Jerusalem in Münster and could baptize without persecution. And, after the destruction of the New Jerusalem, their principal leader expressed himself unfavorably of rebaptizing those who had been baptized in their infancy.

The position of the sects just named regarding infant baptism was identical with that of a number of prominent men in the Protestant state churches. The Zwinglian reformers of Strasburg, for example, expressed themselves in 1524 to the effect that "the baptism of adults alone would be far more in accord with the practice of the early church and also with Scripture," but, nevertheless for the sake of avoiding separation and offence, the infants should be baptized.[1] This was precisely the position of the fanatical Anabaptist sects just named. To escape trouble and persecution they retained infant baptism. As intimated above they defended glaring immorality, such as polygamy and undisguised unchastity. Furthermore, they taught that it is right to deceive "the godless" by outwardly conforming to the practices of the established churches, be they Catholic or Protestant—an attitude of glaring hypocrisy, which was often denounced as such in the strongest terms by Menno Simons.

A conspicuous example of successful deception of this sort is that of David Joris, the founder of the Davidian sect. In 1544 he came to the Swiss city of Basel under the assumed name of John of Bruges as a refugee from the Netherlands, professing to be an adherent of the Reformed faith which was the established creed in this city. He had great talent and material wealth and became one of the prominent men in the state church of Basel. After his death, in 1556, he was accorded the distinction of entombment in St. Leonard's church in Basel. Three years after his death it was discovered, through family quarrels, that John of Bruges was none other than the arch-heretic David Joris, a bigamist. His body was exhumed and burned at the stake.

Since the above named fanatical Anabaptist sects (the Münsterites, Davidians and Batenburgers) defended and practiced glaring immorality, Menno Simons generally speaks of them as the corrupt or immoral sects, and this is obviously a fitting designation. Menno says that they erred even more deplorably than the Roman Church, since they, to a greater or less degree, were advocates of libertinism.[2]

Besides the evangelical Anabaptists and the corrupt sects there were a number of Anabaptist sects and parties which, while not tainted with immoral tendencies, differed more or less vitally from the evangelical Anabaptists. Such were the followers of Balthasar

---

1 Lang, A., *Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Butzers,* Leipzig, 1900, p. 214.

2 On the teachings and practices of these sects compare the chapter, "Appeal to the Corrupt Sects." Menno Simons *Opera,* 1681, pp. 64-67; *Complete Works,* I, pp. 94-98.

Hubmaier, (who rejected the principle of nonresistance), of Augustin Bader (a rank fanatic), of Melchior Hofman, of Adam Pastor, and others.

Of all the Anabaptist sects, with the exception of the evangelical Anabaptists and the followers of Hubmaier, the Münsterites alone had a large following. The history of the Münsterites, however, extended over a period of only about three years. It ended shortly after the destruction of their New Jerusalem at Münster, in June, 1535. Of the Münsterites and others of these sects it may be said that they took the sword and perished by the sword. The history of these sects, with the exception of the Davidians, extended over only a short period. On the other hand, the evangelical Anabaptists, (the Swiss Brethren, Mennonites and Hutterians), have a great history. They weathered the storms of the severest persecution which extended in certain parts of Europe into the eighteenth century. It is therefore obviously permissible to use the designation "Anabaptist movement" with reference to the evangelical Anabaptists only, leaving out of consideration the corrupt sects and other Anabaptist sects which had only a short history.

Menno Simons, as already said, commonly speaks of the Münsterites and other immoral Anabaptist sects as "the corrupt sects." Many pages could be filled with his severe denunciations of the doctrines of these sects. In various places in his writings he demonstrated convincingly the absurdity of the assertion that he and his friends could be classed as belonging to the same movement as these sects. In a booklet published in 1539 he says that the errors of these sects were a thousand times worse than Romanism.[3] (In a later edition of this book he eliminated the words "a thousand times"). The chronicler of the Hutterian Brethren speaks of the Münsterites as "wholly corrupt, wicked men," and of their New Jerusalem as "a terrible abomination established by the devil."[4] In a Confession of 1545 the Hutterian Brethren said: "As concerns the accusation that we are like the Münsterites, and of the same party with them, we would say that all men who know us are aware that no other sect is less like them than we are. We hate their teaching and life to the highest degree and testify that it is of Satanic origin."[5]

---

[3] Menno Simons, *Voele goede vnd Chrystelycke leringhen op den 25. Psalm,* 1539, fol. A VII.

[4] Wolkan, R., *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder,* Wien, 1923, p. 108; cf. *ibid.,* p. 407.

[5] Beck, J., *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn,* etc., Wien, 1883, p. 170,

The question of the possible inner relationship of the various sects called Anabaptists, to each other, or of their doctrinal differences, cannot be decided from the viewpoint of their descent. It will be recalled that Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, the leading reformers of the sixteenth century, had once been staunch Romanists. A day or two after Luther's famous defence before the Diet of Worms he promised subordination to a General Church Council to be called by the Pope. Though he again withdrew this offer, he was always of the opinion that the Roman Catholic Church is a true Christian church. In his booklet *On Anabaptism,* written in 1528, he says that the Roman Church despite her errors "has the true Spirit, faith, baptism, sacrament, keys, ministry, prayer, Holy Scriptures and all that a Christian church should have."[6] There was within the Lutheran Church a strong minority, led by Melanchthon, which ardently hoped for reunion with Rome. Menno Simons pointed out that the differences between the evangelical Anabaptists and the Münsterites were greater than those between Lutheranism and the Church of Rome.[7] And only on the erroneous theory that the Obbenites and Mennonites constituted but one sect with the followers of Melchior Hofman can the sect of Münster be supposed to have descended from evangelical Anabaptists.

Hofman, the first to re-baptize in the Netherlands, was in turn a Lutheran, Zwinglian, and Anabaptist. Bernt Rothmann was a Lutheran before he united with the Münsterites and became their leading theologian. Can this be interpreted to mean that Lutheranism represents in any sense the same movement as the New Jerusalem in Münster? Is the Reformed Church to be held responsible for the rise in her midst of such corrupt sects as the Zionites of Ronsdorf and the Buttlar sect? Since the World War a number of fanatical sects have risen within the Protestant state churches of the central European countries. Who would venture the assertion that they represent the same movement as the state churches, because of common descent and of agreement on the question of baptism? And one cannot speak of agreement on baptism between the Mennonites and the corrupt sects.

The author of the article "Anabaptists" in the most recent edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (I, p. 858) says: "The continuity of a sect is to be traced in its principles and not in its adherents, and it must be remembered that Menno and his followers expressly repudiated the distinctive doctrines of the Mün-

---

6 *Luthers Werke,* Erlangen edition, XXVI, p. 258; Weimar edition, XXVI, p. 147.
7 Menno Simons, *Opera,* 1681, p. 148; *Complete Works,* Elkhart, 1871, I, p. 197.

ster Anabaptists." However, the Münster Anabaptists and the corrupt sects did not descend from the evangelical Anabaptists. The supposition that Melchior Hofman, to whose influence the rise of the first of the immoral sects, the Münsterites, must be partly ascribed, was ever identified with one of the evangelical Anabaptist sects is untenable. Professor Walter Kuehler says that, considering the final principles, a Münster kingdom could not have grown out of Lutheranism or Zwinglianism.[8] With equal and more right it can be said that it could not have grown out of the Swiss Brethren movement. The fundamental differences and contrasts between the two movements will be pointed out directly.

Are the Münsterites and the Evangelical Anabaptists to be Classed Together?

As indicated above, the protests of the evangelical Anabaptists against being classed with the Münsterites and other corrupt sects were in vain. This classification offered too good an excuse to the state church leaders for the persecution of the dissenters. Within more recent times a number of prominent Protestant church historians have freely recognized the falsity and unreasonableness of classifying the evangelical Anabaptists as of one and the same movement with all others who, against their protest, were given the nickname Anabaptists. It may be recalled here that probably most of the writers who hold this view to-day show an inclination to excuse the persecution of the evangelical Anabaptists, and this is indeed what one would reasonably expect of them. Could the governments be blamed for suppressing a sect which represented the same movement as the Münsterites and the other corrupt sects that defended and practised open immorality? The persecution of the evangelical Anabaptists could in that case be scarcely regarded as persecution. The common assertion of the persecutors that the Mennonite martyrs were not martyrs at all, but rather, as stated by Melanchthon, were martyrs of the devil, would be substantially correct.

The practical meaning of the view that all "Anabaptists" represented one and the same movement is apparent from the following quotation from the larger work of Heinrich Bullinger, (the successor to Zwingli as the head of the Reformed state church of Zurich), against the Swiss Brethren, published in 1560:

---

[8] Hauck-Herzog, *Real-Encyklopaedie*,[3] XIII, p. 553.

> Without any doubt, God in His faithfulness and kindness meant through this Münsterite affair to reveal for the benefit of the whole world and especially for his own elect the great deceptive falsity of Anabaptism and of all that is secretly hiding behind it. Yea, God meant to open the eyes of all ministers of the Word, as well as of all princes and magistrates, that they would keep watch the more diligently against these murderous, dissimulating, deceitful wolves, and that they may in time, before it be too late, with wise forethought take proper measures of prevention, lest afterwards, when the Anabaptists are sufficiently equipped and prepared [for an attack on the government] the magistrates will see their deception and false spirituality which in truth is great cruelty, as is clear from the history of these Münsterites, and will suffer irreparable loss to soul, honor, property, and life.[9] — Here I suppose the Anabaptists of today will say that not all Anabaptists hold the same views of these Münsterites, and that they do not regard them with pleasure. My answer is, But who can trust the Anabaptists of today [the Swiss Brethren] who present themselves so very innocent? Therefore, you who today pretend to be harmless Anabaptists, if you desire that we expect of you that which is good, and not what is evil and harmful, renounce the sect which from the beginning at all times and in all places was found false and faithless. Even if for a short time their hypocrisy seemed attractive and beautiful, in the end it always turned out to be abominable, dense darkness causing great loss.[10]

Dr. Heinrich Detmer, an authority on the history of the Anabaptists of Münster, in his book on John von Leiden, says:

> Not with the least semblance of right can it be said that the toleration of, or the demand for polygamy was ever included in the tendencies of Anabaptism as such, or that it corresponded to the religious or other views of the Anabaptists in general. The idea of polygamy, the first attempt to introduce it in Münster, the manner of proclaiming and realizing it, all this was solely a fruit of the brain of John of Leyden.

Bernt Rothmann and the other preachers of the sect of Münster, at first persistently resisted John in regard to polygamy, and according to the testimony of Johann Klopriss who was in Münster at the time, very many of the people opposed it. For eight days John disputed with the preachers on this question in the city hall. Finally he asserted that all who further contradicted this institution of the Holy Ghost would be excluded from God's grace. This meant that they were in immediate danger of their lives. By such arguments the preachers of Münster were finally led to be-

---

9 Bullinger, H., *Der Widertoufferen ursprung, fürgang, Secten,* etc., 1561, p. 46 b.
10 *Ibid.,* p. 49 a.

lieve that John was right. Polygamy was instituted and all persons of marriageable age were ordered to marry. Somewhat later John gave orders that men must not ask for a woman's hand in groups but singly and a man who did not get the consent of the one whose hand he sought, must seek for himself another wife. Such orders were given because of the terrible conditions prevailing in the city after the institution of polygamy had been proclaimed. Many felt that moral conditions in the city had become unbearable. The blacksmith Mollenhecke with forty-eight others, who dared to revolt, were overcome and executed on John's orders. Even after this event a few men mustered courage sufficient to openly denounce polygamy. They also were put to death. In another case a Jerusalemite said in John's hearing that life at Münster, instead of being Christian, was but adultery and debauchery. John drew his sword and killed him instantly.

Thereafter it seems no one dared to object. The king of the Münsterite Jerusalem had become master of the situation. He surrounded himself with an imposing court. Some priestly vestments were yet found in the city, and the former tailor John of Leiden had them converted into royal robes for himself. The royal insignia included a golden chain which supported a ball representing the earth. John of Leiden ruled with untold arrogance over the New Israel, as the Münsterites called themselves. Theoretically, communism existed at Münster, but the idea of the church as a brotherhood was trampled under foot by John. For many months terrible famine reigned in the city but John, like the Rich Man, fared sumptuously every day. With unheard-of ostentation in wearing apparel and ornaments he showed himself to the people three times weekly, sitting on an elaborate throne in the market place. The prominent men of his court were gathered around him on such occasions, all decked in gay vestments. Those who approached his throne were compelled to fall on their knees, and when in solemn procession he, with his retinue, walked through the streets, the people also must kneel before him. At the same time he seems to have had a weakness for playing the executioner on those who fell into disfavor. Among those whom he pierced through with his own sword was one of his wives who had infuriated him by expressing a desire to leave the city.

The Münsterites had much in common with the Protestant state churches, far more indeed than with the evangelical Anabaptists. The latter emphatically rejected the union of church and state, and insisted that a church in which all subjects and citizens are compelled to consider themselves members, is not a true New

Testament church. The Münsterites on the contrary constituted a state church, establishing a close union between church and state. The general type of the state church in Münster was the same as of the Zwinglian state church at Zurich; like the latter, the Münster kingdom was a theocracy.[11] On the point of church discipline also the Münsterites agreed perfectly with the Zwinglians. Both the Münsterites and Zwingli taught that while church discipline had been necessary in apostolic times because there was no Christian civil government, it was superfluous under such a government where transgression and crime are punished by the magistrates.

The evangelical Anabaptists, on the other hand, held that scriptural discipline is a vital characteristic of a true Christian church. They emphatically taught the principle of nonresistance, while the Münsterites taught that all who refused to unite with them and contradicted their teaching should be put to death with the sword. The evangelical Anabaptists believed the civil government to be instituted of God and stressed the duty of subjection, while the Münsterites undertook to destroy all other civil governments and kill the magistrates without mercy. Melchior Hofman did not recognize the baptism of the Swiss Brethren as valid, and the Münsterites took the same attitude toward the Swiss Brethren. A trustworthy early chronicler said of the Münsterites, "All other Anabaptists wherever they may be, are damned by them."[12]

Obbe Philips, for some time the principal leader of the Dutch "Brethren" who later adopted the name Mennonites, says in his *Confessions* that the Münsterites of the Netherlands swore to murder him, and in 1536 at Bockholt similar threats were made by them against Obbe's friends. Baptism, as practiced at Münster, was a mere travesty of believers' baptism. Believers' baptism necessarily implies the principle of voluntarism. In Münster "the godless" were given the choice of submitting to baptism or leaving the city. True, in anticipation of the imminent siege of the city, it was considered a political necessity to drive out the dissenters, but this does not change the fact that they were expelled from the city unless they accepted baptism. However, some time later there were evidently some unbaptized adults in the city. It was decided that such should be tolerated in the city if they did not contradict Münsterite teaching.

The Münsterites called themselves the New Israel and held

---

11 Farner, A., *Die Lehre von Kirche und Staat bei Zwingli,* Tübingen, 1930, pp. 111 f., 123 ff; Burckhardt, P., *Huldreich Zwingli,* Zurich, 1918, p. 73 ff.

12 Keller, L., *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien,* p. 456.

the Old Testament Scriptures to be the most authoritative portion of the Bible. "The principal and indubitable Scriptures in accordance with which all Scripture must be expounded," said the spokesman of the Münsterites, "are Moses and the Prophets. These are the authoritative Scriptures." The truth of the New Testament Scriptures, he says further, is founded on these principal Scriptures. In this respect the Münsterite position was more closely related to that of the Protestant state churches than of the evangelical Anabaptists. The latter took the very reverse position and held that the Old Testament Scriptures must be interpreted in the light of the New Testament, and were not authoritative for the New Covenant on many points, such as the literal priesthood and sacrificial offerings, and many other features of Old Testament legislation, among them divorce, war, the oath, and other points mentioned and changed by Christ. The Protestant state churches, on the other hand, held the Old and New Testament Scriptures to be of equal authority for the Christian church. The Münsterites also held the new revelations, which, they believed, came to them through their prophets, to be of equal authority with the Scriptures. They were Sabbatarians, keeping Saturday as the day of the Lord.

Did the Sect of Münster Stress the Purity of the Church at the Expense of Personal Piety?

Our author makes much of the theory that there is an inherent contrast and antagonism between insistence on personal piety and insistence on the purity of the brotherhood or church; in his opinion this theory is, as it were, the key for the understanding of Anabaptism. It is by no means clear on what grounds he takes the assumption that emphasis on the purity of the church is inconsistent with stressing individual piety. Do not both endeavors vitally supplement each other? Clearly, unless the purity of the church is mere pretence, personal purity must be considered of equal importance. Dr. Kuehler thinks that both the Mennonites and the sect of Münster stressed the purity of the church at the expense of personal piety. In his opinion the early Mennonites undertook to establish a church which was in an absolute sense without spot or wrinkle. The attitude of the Mennonites on this question will be duly considered later. As just said, our author makes a similar statement regarding the sect of Münster. He says, "The New Jerusalem was the personification of the endeavor to form, not the religious personality but a holy community" (191).

The sect of Münster, as a matter of fact, gave their iniquities a religious cloak. As Professor Kuehler says, "they justified every sin by an appeal to the kingdom of God"(71), but the plain fact remains that, to quote our author again, "brothel-like conditions" prevailed in the Münsterite Jerusalem(120) and these conditions were officially sanctioned; they were sins of the church rather than of individuals. In all Christendom there was no church whose moral corruption was stinking to the heavens as was the Jerusalem established by John of Leiden. Is it thinkable that he, while he was in power, actually persuaded himself that his iniquities were defensible before God and man? We have indicated that in introducing polygamy he faced the opposition not only of the preachers but of the great majority of the people of Münster. Many abhorred the abominations introduced by the ecclesiastical leaders. It was impossible for them to flee the city, for its siege had already begun. As concerns polygamy, John's purpose was accomplished with the establishment of his harem.

Long before the fall and destruction of the New Jerusalem John of Leiden obviously realized that polygamy was not an asset to the cause in which he was the principal figure. The weak Bernt Rothmann, the theological spokesman of the sect of Münster, in consequence defended polygamy only in his first book, entitled *Restitution,* not in his later writings. Heinrich Gresbeck, a deserter from the besieged city, said that "polygamy had become disliked in Münster and its ungodliness was recognized." Shortly before his death John confessed that the sins of his kingdom had caused the ruin which had befallen it. He owned that he had erred in point of polygamy, and manifested sincere repentance and regret for the evil he had done. He confessed that if he could be made to suffer death ten times, he had deserved it.[13] What then of the statement of our author that the Münster Jerusalem (with all its official sins and abominations) was "the personification of the endeavor to form a holy community"(191)? Would not the Münsterites themselves, including the victims of the wrath of the murderous king whom he killed without trial or sentence, and his sycophants, and his sixteen wives, as well as the king himself, be surprised to see such a statement? And what would Menno Simons and his friends have to say about it?

We have given the Anabaptism of Münster particular attention to indicate the contrasts between this sect and the Mennonites,

---

[13] Löffler, K., *Die Wiedertäufer in Münster,* Jena, 1923, p. 267.

and to show the groundlessness of the opinion that the New Jerusalem in Münster was the personification of the endeavor to form a holy community. True, our author does not hold that polygamy was a fruit of Anabaptist tendencies and attitudes, but the fact remains that it was a vital characteristic of the sect of Münster. It was polygamy that gave the New Jerusalem in Münster its essentially criminal aspect. Now, if the theory were acceptable that all Anabaptist sects represented one and the same movement, it would indeed, as our author says, be "a painful truth" that Münster is "an indelible stain" (189) adhering to the movement of which Mennonitism was an integral part.

NOTES

THE TERM "RELIGION" NOT A BIBLICAL CONCEPT

G. H. Enss

The term "religion" does not occur in the original text of the Bible; it cannot be found in the Old nor in the New Testament. The word itself is of uncertain origin and conveys an idea which is completely foreign to original Christian thinking. And since I am writing for our own fellowship, let me add that our Mennonite forefathers never read it in their German Bibles, nor can it be found in the Russian translation of the Greek Catholic Church which is known as one of the best translations in Christendom. And in both of these languages the word "religion" is well-known in secular literature.

It was under the influence of Latin philosophical terminology that the term "religion" entered into the English translations, but even here it plays a very insignificant part and with the exception of one single passage it bears no reference to Christianity. And even in this one passage it does not refer to Christianity as such but only to one certain aspect of the outward expression of Christian behavior. We shall examine all of the Bible passages where the English word "religion" appears and try to determine the significance of the word in each case in the light of its context.

In Acts 13:43, speaking of the proselytes in Antioch in Pisidia, Luke uses the term "sebomenon" which in the Authorized Version is translated by "religious" proselytes. There is no special objection to this translation except that it is no translation. Could there be any "irreligious" proselytes? As soon as we read in the English or the American Revised Version, "devout" proselytes, we have a translation and one that conveys the true meaning of the original.

In Acts 17:22 reference is made to idol worship and the Greek term used is "deisidaimonesterous." The American Revised Version translates "very religious," the English Revised says "somewhat superstitious" and the Authorized says "too superstitious." Here it is evident again that the term "religious" misses the specific meaning of the Greek term, which really means "very subservient to the gods" or demons.

In Gal. 1:13, 14 Paul refers to his former relationship to Judaism and uses the corresponding Greek term "Ioudaismos" but in the translations we read "Jew's religion." That the word "religion" here is only a superfluous addition is evident enough; there is no need of it here.

A fourth Greek term which is also translated "religion" is "threskeia." It occurs in three different passages. The first occurrence is in Col. 2:18 where it refers to a strange cult of angel-worship. Here it is rendered in English "worshipping." In Acts 26:5 it refers to the Jewish form of worship and is rendered "religion." Why not "worshipping" as in the first case? In both cases it means the outward behavior in the act of service.

So we have four widely divergent Greek terms with very different specific meanings and all of them translated with the term "religion" or "religious." In every case some real English word would have served far

better. And none of the Greek terms have any etymological relationships to the anglicised Latin term. We observe also that in all of these cases we found no reference to Christian faith but rather to idol worship, or to proselytism, or to the cult of angel-worship, or to Judaism.

In the last passage, James 1:26, 27, the Greek term "threskeia" which here again is rendered "religion" refers to one particular aspect of Christian service. The German translation says "Gottesdienst"—"service unto God," and the Russian gives it "blagochestie" which means "wellbehavior." The passage reads in the Authorized Version: "If any man among you seem to be *religious*, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's *religion* is vain. Pure *religion* and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." Reading it after the German version which in the Mennonite Church for at least three and a half centuries has established a definite concept and which should not be surrendered to the modernistic idea of the present time, we find the following injunction in the Word of God: "If any man among you seem to be *serving God* and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's *service unto God* is vain. Pure *service unto God* and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." The reading is clear and the thought which our forefathers used to get from this passage is this: *The hypocrite who seeks to add glory unto himself by misrepresenting his brother will finally perish.* In the third chapter James gives more details about this matter. This is an important passage in the Word of God, but the word "religion" is altogether too inadequate in this connection. A word that is used to say so many different things in the end says nothing. So it is with the term "religion." Modernists like it because it gives them the liberty of misrepresenting the Gospel of Christ. They like to argue on the basis of the English translation of James 1:27 that Christianity is nothing but charity work and social service. No faith in the divine Christ is necessary, they say, no cross, no resurrection, no supernatural work of grace, just a social program, that is all that matters in Christianity. This is the modernistic concept which superficial persons derive from the faulty English translation. This concept they proceed to identify with the Christian faith and the confusion is complete. What James says here is most certainly an important aspect of Christian behavior but he did not mean to define the Christian faith. But modernism is very anxious to put it in just that light.

This brief investigation shows clearly how little the concept of religion has to do with biblical truth. Its meaning was uncertain from the very beginning and to this day it can not be used without connotations which are foreign to true Christianity. It cannot be even located in the language which produced it. We do not know whether it was derived from "relegere" or "religare." About a century before Christ the Roman philosopher and orator, Marcus Tullius Cicero, attempted a definition of the word and sought to establish a derivation from the Latin verb "relegere" (to reflect). Later Lactantius contended for a derivation of the term religion from "religare" (to rebind). Either one of these terms is rather insignificant, and of course we cannot fix the meaning in which the word religion is used to-day upon the basis of these roots. It depends upon

the ingenuity of fertile minds to put into the term what it does not originally signify. Consequently we have this great divergence of opinion in the past and the complete confusion at present. The term cannot be defined on the basis of biblical usage since the concept is unknown to the inspired writers. Whenever one wishes to make a scientific study of the matter one is therefore led to sources outside of the Bible.

In Christian theological discussions the term "religion" played a very insignificant part until about two hundred years ago when rationalism began making special use of it. Then Schleiermacher, the father of modern theology, fell in love with it and practically made the philosophical concept of religion the basis of his theology. Whoever wishes to find out what Schleiermacher's concept of religion is, let him read his "Discourses on Religion." Schleiermacher's work established the concept in liberalistic protestant theology; it was quickly embraced by the liberal schools everywhere though here and there with some modifications. And to-day some misinformed persons who know nothing of the history of theology defend it as an orthodox long-established concept of the Church. Once more, ignorance is bliss, and confusion is complete.

Let me quote an honest confession of one of Schleiermacher's modernistic followers. It is taken from Lagarde's *Deutsche Schriften,* page 46: "Das Wort Religion ist im entschiedensten Gegensatz gegen das in der lutherischen, reformierten und katholischen Kirche geltende Wort Glauben eingeführt und setzt überall die deistische Kritik des allgemeinen christlichen Offenbarungsglaubens voraus." Rendering this in English it reads as follows: "The word 'religion' was introduced in absolute contradiction to the word 'faith' prevalent in the Lutheran, the Reformed and the Catholic Church and presupposes in each case a deistic criticism of the general Christian concept of revelation." This ought to be enough of a warning for everyone who wishes to be a true Christian theologian.

Conservative theologians are becoming more and more conscious of this great illusion foisted upon us by modernism. It is for this reason that leading fundamentalists are beginning to reject the word "religion" in relation to Christian Faith and are taking issue with the modernists on this matter. The best book on this subject is written by the well known fundamentalist who is also a leading pre-millennialist, the editor of the monthly periodical Our Hope, Dr. A. C. Gaebelein of New York. The book is entitled *Christianity or Religion.* It is one of Dr. Gaebelein's very best books and ought to be read by every Christian who is interested in the vital issues of our day. Whoever reads this book will have an intelligent answer to that notorious "Laymen's Mission Report," which was put out by the modernists of this country. We must return to true biblical thinking and eliminate unscriptural concepts such as "religion," with reference to Christian faith. Let the modernists speak of "religious education," fundamentalists have adopted the term "Christian education." When we speak of the life in the spirit we do not mean "religious" but "spiritual life." Let us therefore earnestly and intelligently contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints.

Editor's Note.—In proposing that the term "religion" should no longer be used to refer to Christianity, Professor Enss is conscious that a real problem in terminology is created. It is true that during the past several

generations "religion" has come into general usage, even among evangelical Christians, as a term referring to Christianity. There would be no need or occasion to propose a change in this usage if it were not for the fact that modern usage has stamped the word with a meaning that cannot possibly be applied to Christianity.

In urging the change, the purpose of Professor Enss is to avoid the confusion which arises due to this new usage of the word "religion" and thus escape the very real danger that the liberal modernistic idea of religion should creep into evangelical Christian thinking. His first article on "Religion and Christianity," which appeared in the REVIEW for July, 1932, made plain that there is an absolute difference between true biblical Christianity and modern religion as the word is currently used by philosophers, psychologists, and liberal theologians. We submitted that article to such outstanding conservative evangelical leaders as Dr. James M. Gray, Dr. J. Gresham Machen, Dr. A. C. Gaebelein, and Dr. Harry Rimmer, and we are glad to note from their replies that they heartily sympathize with Professor Enss in his basic contention and that they endorse his general position, although one of the replies disagrees on the matter of changing the usage of the term "religion."

Professor Enss willingly admits that it is somewhat difficult to carry through consistently the change in usage of the term religion which he proposes. Unless the evangelical Christian world in general should follow such usage, it would be practically impossible to hold to it. The editor agrees with Professor Enss, however, that in view of the great necessity to-day for a clear and sharp distinction between true Christianity, which is based upon the revelation of God in His Word, and modern religion such a change is desirable and that furthermore it would be thoroughly justified in view of the fact that the general concept of "religion" is not a biblical concept. The brief discussion which is given above is intended to demonstrate the unbiblical character of the idea which is conveyed by the word "religion."